The Dissertation Committee for Matthew Rae Sayers certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Feeding the Ancestors:
Ancestor Worship in Ancient Hinduism and Buddhism

Committee:

____
Joel Brereton, Co-Supervisor

____
J. Patrick Olivelle, Co-Supervisor

____
Oliver Freiberger

____
Janice Leoshko

____
Cynthia Talbot

Feeding the Ancestors:
Ancestor Worship in Ancient Hinduism and Buddhism

by

Matthew Rae Sayers, B.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2008

डेनिस रे सेयर्स एतत्ते

रे व्हिलबर सेयर्स एतत्ते

राबर्ट सेयर्स एतत्ते

Acknowledgements

ṛṇáṃ ha vái jāyate yó ‘sti | sá jā́yamāna evá devébhya ṛ́ṣibhyaḥ pitṛ́bhyo manuṣyébhyaḥ
— *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 1.7.2.1

Dicebat Bernardus Carnotensis nos esse quasi nanos, gigantium humeris insidentes, ut possimus plura eis et remotiora videre, non utique proprii visus acumine, aut eminentia corporis, sed quia in altum subvenimur et extollimur magnitudine gigantean.
— John of Salisbury, *Metalogician*

As the ancient Brahmin authors conceived of men being born as a debt, so can we conceive of the Doctor of Philosophy being born a debt, instead of a debt to the Ṛṣis, gods, and ancestor, though, the Ph.D. is born a debt to his teachers, *gurubhya ṛṇam*. To the authors of the ancient Indian texts the triple debt was an expression of obligation and one particular aspect of that debt, the debt to the ancestors, struck me as analogous to the debt, and its concomitant obligations, that I have accrued in writing this dissertation. According to the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, the debt to the ancestors is redeemed by having sons; in fact the debt is passed on to the son, as with his material debts and assets. As the Brahmin is born a debt to his ancestors, so the Ph.D. is a born a debt to his gurus. Through the labor of the dissertation, the graduate student is reborn as a Doctor of Philosophy. The literature review and the citations throughout the dissertation evidence his debt to those whose work he relied upon; this work would not be possible without the work of the pioneers of this field. As Bernard of Chartres, quoted by John of Salisbury,

said "we are like dwarfs on the shoulders of giants, so that we can see more than they, and things at a greater distance, not by virtue of any sharpness of sight on our part, or any physical distinction, but because we are carried high and raised up by their giant size." But just as the son's debt to his more distant ancestors is less immediate than the debt to his father, so a Ph.D.'s debt to the classical works of Religious Studies and Indology are less immediate than those to the teachers who teach him directly, those who shape the way he thinks, who in fact make him a Ph.D. The former are instrumental, but the latter are constitutive of the Doctor of Philosophy. This debt cannot be paid off it must be passed on, to one's intellectual 'children.' By having sons the Brahmin pays off and transfers his debt to his son; by teaching, the Ph.D. pays off his debt, transferring it to his intellectual 'children.' The only way to redeem oneself of the debt to the gurus is to teach, to father other doctors. Patrick Olivelle and Joel Brereton have had a tremendous direct impact on my education. If I succeed in being half the teacher, mentor, and example that each of them has been for me, I will feel my debt acquitted to my teachers. For the moment I offer them heartfelt thanks for their generosity of time, advice, and support. My other professors are also due a debt of thanks; Oliver Freiberger, Kathy Hansen, Traude Harzer, Janice Leoshko, Martha Selby, Rupert Snell, and Cynthia Talbot have all driven me to do better than I thought I was able, and by their efforts I am a better scholar. My fellow graduate students have often taught me as much about being a good student and teacher as anyone else. It would be foolhardy to try to name all those who shaped my experiences, but I offer special thanks to David Brick, Stephen Brown, Tracy Buck, Neil Dalal, Raymond Burton Estes, Gardner Harris, Elliott McCarter, Mark McClish, Urmila Patil, and Jarrod Whitaker. The support I have received outside of the classroom has been invaluable, relieving the pressure of graduate school more often than I can say; Cary and Ashley Curtiss and Jennifer Tipton in particular are largely

responsible for me remaining sane throughout this process. To my family and friends, who—though ignorant of the detail, process, time frame, or even the point of my work—gave me encouragement, love, and support, I offer my thanks. To my wife, Margery, who put up with my self-doubt, deadline nervousness, and late nights as well as more moves, periods of ambiguity, and general stress than anyone deserves, all the while reminding me that there was life beyond these stressors, I offer far too little, merely my continued struggle to become the man she deserves.

Feeding the Ancestors:

Ancestor Worship in Ancient Hinduism and Buddhism

Publication No._____________

Matthew Rae Sayers, PhD

The University of Texas at Austin, 2008

Supervisor: Joel Brereton and J. Patrick Olivelle

This dissertation seeks to provide an insight into the ritual life of the everyday religious actor of ancient India and the intellectual context of the contestation between the Brahmin and Buddhist religious experts over the construction of the householder ideal through a careful examination of the discourse on ancestor worship. The historical context of this dissertation is an important turning point in the religious history of South Asia: the transition from the Vedic religion to the formative stages of Hinduism, coincident with the rise of Buddhism. The theological construction of the ideal householder is the focal point of this cultural transformation in both traditions, and this study focuses on this everyday religious actor instead of the religious experts, exceptional religious figures, who usually occupy the spotlight in similar studies. The householder is the center of gravity around which both Brahmanical and Buddhist scholastic traditions revolve; they shape and construct their ideologies in response to the needs and desires of the householder, while advancing their own moral and social ideals. Both the Brahmanical and Buddhist scholars react to a broader religious tradition, Householder

Religion, and this dissertation demonstrates two key characteristics of this response: 1. Brahmin and Buddhist experts occupy the same discursive space in their efforts to construct their notion of the 'proper householder' and 2. both traditions construct the ritual obligations of the householder in such a way as to secure for themselves, among other things, the role of mediator between the householder and various supernatural entities. This thesis focuses on the ancestral rites for three reasons. First, ancestral rites is given a central place throughout the period under discussion. Second, the family, the primary context for the householder, is defined by its lineage, thus the ancestors are central to the householder's self-definition in both social and religious terms. Third, the texts that describe the rituals of ancestor worship demonstrate the characteristics above more fully in both traditions than do texts that address the householder's other ritual obligations. Additionally, this allows me to briefly outline the historical development of ancestor worship in ancient India, a task long overdue.

Table of Contents

List of Tables xiv

Introduction...1

Historical Context 10

Scholarly Context...15

Householder Religion 16

Ancestor Worship 21

Methodology 23

Chapter Outline 24

Chapter 1: The Householder 27

The Householder 28

pañcamahāyajña: The Five Great Sacrifices 37

Five Great Sacrifices in the Brāhmaṇas 38

Five Great Sacrifices in the Śrautasūtras 39

Five Great Sacrifices in the Gṛhyasūtras 40

The Five Great Sacrifices in the Dharmasūtras 43

The '*huta* Scheme' 46

The '*huta* Scheme' and the *mahāyajña* Theology 47

Homologizing the *mahāyajña* Theology and the '*huta* Scheme' 48

The *pañca bali* 54

Language, Overlap, and the Number Five:
The *pañca bali* and the *pañcamahāyajña* 58

The Triple Debt...61

Debt 62

The Triple Debt..66

Purpose of the Triple Debt..68

The Triple Debt in the *sūtra* Literature...69

The Triple Debt in the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*.......................................73

The Triple Debt in the *Mahābhārata*...75

Pāṇḍu and the Quest for More Sons 75
Mandapāla and the Fruitless Trip to Heaven 77
Buddhist Reflections on Ancestor Worship....................................80
A Son's Obligations 82
pañcamahāyajña and Triple Debt: Distinct Discursive Threads 85
Householder in Religious Discourse: A Shared Discursive Space 87

Chapter 2: Ancestor Worship..91
Vedic Ancestor Worship 92
piṇḍapitṛyajña: A Summary 93
piṇḍapitṛyajña: An Interpretation 96
pitṛyajña: A Summary 97
piṇḍapitṛyajña and *pitṛyajña*: A Comparison 100
Arguing for Priority 103
Ancestor Worship in the *saṃhitā* Literature 108
pitṛyajña in the *Ṛg Veda* 108
Ritual Implications of *svadhā* 112
svadhā in the Brāhmaṇas 113
svadhā in the *saṃhitā* literature 115
svadhā: Its More General Connotation 115
svadhā in Funerary Contexts within the *Ṛg Veda*..........................120
svadhā in the Atharva Veda...123
svadhā in Funerary Contexts within the *Atharva Veda* 123
svadhā in Other Contexts within the *Atharva Veda*..........................127
Ancestor Worship in the *saṃhitā* literature:
Some Conclusions and Speculation 130
Ancestor Worship in the Gṛhyasūtras 133
The *piṇḍapitṛyajña*: Ancestor Worship in the *anvaṣṭakya* 134
Summary of the *anvaṣṭakya* in the *Gobhila Gṛhyasūtra* 135
piṇḍpitṛyajña in Other Gṛhyasūtras 139
piṇḍapitṛyajña: Old and New 142

śrauta piṇḍapitṛyajña in the Gṛhyasūtras 142
"New" Developments in the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*....143
Non-veg Offerings: A Complete Meal?....143
Elimination of Priests....144
Exchange....145
The *śrāddha*: New Forms of Ancestor Worship....147
Four Types of *śrāddha*....149
parvaṇa śrāddha 149
ekoddiṣṭa śrāddha 150
sapiṇḍīkaraṇa śrāddha 152
ābhyudayika śrāddha 154
Two Innovations 157
Feeding Brahmins and Brahmins as Proxy....157
Brahmin as Stand-in for the Pitṛs....160
Specialization....165
piṇḍapitṛyajña versus *śrāddha*: Clear-cut Distinctions? 165
Absence of the Label *śrāddha* 168
Categories: Blurred Distinctions and all....170
śrāddha in the *dharma* Literature 175
śrāddha in the Dharmasūtras 175
śrāddha in the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* 178
Buddhist History 181
Jāṇussoṇisutta....182
The *Petavatthu*....187
The *śrāddha* for the Biscuit Doll 188
Ghosts Outside the Walls....192
Chapter 3: Old Goals and New Concerns....200
Aims of Ancestor Rituals in the Vedic Texts 201
Feeding the Ancestors....202
Improving the Station of the Pitṛs....204

Acquisition of Material Benefits..206
Sons 206
Wealth 208
Acquisition of Non-material Benefits...209
Long Life 209
Protection and Well-Being in This World 210
Heaven 212
New Concerns about Ancestor Rituals in the *dharma* Literature 215
Efficacy of Meat Offerings in the *śrāddha* 218
Inexhaustible Benefit 223
Soteriological Synthesis in the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*....................225
Benefits for the Sacrificer 226
Old Goals and New Concerns: *Saddha* in the Buddhist Literature 228
Chapter 4: Mediation 232
Vedic Mediation...233
Agni as Mediator..235
Brahmin as Mediator...236
The Characteristics of a Brahmin to Be Invited...............................238
Qualities of the Brahmins in the Dharmasūtras 240
Qualities of the Brahmins in the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* 248
Buddhist Efforts to Appropriate the Role of Mediator 253
Undermining the Authority of Brahmins..254
Substitutes for Agni 257
The Field of Merit...258
Conclusion 263
Abbreviations..270
Bibliography 272
Vita 287

List of Tables

Table 1: Vedic and post-Vedic texts used in this study organized by *śākhā*. 11
Table 2: Correspondence between the *mahāyajñas* and the '*huta* scheme'. 48
Table 3: '*huta* scheme' in the Gṛhyasūtras and the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*. 51
Table 4: Definitions of the *pañcamahāyajña* and the '*huta* scheme'
found in the corresponding text. 53
Table 5: Comparison of *pañca bali* and *pañcamahāyajña*. 60
Table 6: Reference to different types of *śrāddha* in the Gṛhyasūtras. 171
Table 7: Duration of benefit for Pitṛs from different offerings in the Dharmasūtras. 220
Table 8: Duration of benefit for Pitṛs from different offerings in
the Dharmasūtras, the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*, and the *Yājnavalkya Smṛti*. 222
Table 9: Correspondences between Brahmanical and Buddhist Ideologies. 261

Introduction

The historical context of this dissertation is an important turning point in the religious history of South Asia: the transition from the Vedic religion to the formative stages of Hinduism, i.e., from the late Vedic period to the early Dharmaśāstra tradition, coincident with the rise of Buddhism, that is, the second half of the first millennium BCE. The ideological construction of the ideal householder is the focal point of this cultural transformation in both traditions, and this study focuses on this everyday religious actor instead of the religious experts, exceptional religious figures, who usually occupy the spotlight in similar studies. The householder is the center of gravity around which both Brahmanical and Buddhist scholastic traditions revolve; they shape and construct their ideologies in response to the needs and desires of the householder, while advancing their own moral and social ideals. Both the Brahmanical and Buddhist scholars react to a broader religious tradition, Householder Religion, and this dissertation demonstrates two key characteristics of this response: 1. Brahmin and Buddhist experts occupy the same discursive space in their efforts to construct their notion of the 'proper householder' and 2. both traditions construct the ritual obligations of the householder in such a way as to secure for themselves, among other things, the role of mediator between the householder and various supernatural entities. If it were possible, proving such a thesis across the breadth of the householder's ritual responsibilities would be beyond the scope of a single volume. This thesis focuses instead on one aspect of the householder's ritual obligation, the ancestral rites. In short, this work seeks to provide an insight into the ritual life of the everyday religious actor of ancient India and the intellectual context of the contestation between the Brahmin and Buddhist religious experts over the construction of the householder ideal through a careful examination of the discourse on ancestor worship.

Several important dichotomies lie beneath the surface of this statement and need to be unpacked: 1. ritual life vs. renunciation; 2. everyday religious actor vs. religious expert; and 3. Brahmanical tradition vs. Buddhist tradition. Each of these distinctions generates a great deal of reflection, within the tradition and among scholars. While each finds some expression in my interpretation throughout this dissertation, each also merits a brief discussion here.

With respect to the first distinction, this study focuses on the historical developments within the Indian ritual tradition, thus it necessarily omits all but the briefest discussion of renunciation, and that only in the context of the ritualist constructions of social obligation.[1] The ritual tradition is grounded in the ritual obligations of the primary religious actor in ancient India, the householder, Sanskrit, *gṛhapati*, and Pāli, *gahapati*. The Brahmanical and Buddhist sources each present different problems with respect to talking about the householder.

Despite the fact that most of the Brahmanical literature is aimed at householders, the word is seldom used; it is an assumed feature of the texts reviewed. The earliest material, the *Ṛg Veda* and the *Atharva Veda*, are poetic and thus do not discuss the ritual or the person performing the ritual directly. The Brāhmaṇas and the Śrautasūtras address the ritual priests and the sacrificer—who is certainly a householder, but his role as sacrificer is all that concerns the authors. The Gṛhyasūtras address themselves to the householder,

[1] The ritualist-renunciate dichotomy includes soteriological differences that are often glossed over in treatments of Indian religion. The rituals of ancestor worship, the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*, the *pitṛyajña*, and the *śrāddha*, in the literature of the period of this study all describe an eternal stay in heaven. The soteriology of the philosophical tradition, often associated with Hinduism more generally, includes the notion of *saṃsāra*, the world of suffering, *karma*, transmigrationally significant action, and reincarnation. This notion of the transmigration of the *ātman* precludes the existence of any permanent abode of the soul; the only non-temporary state is *mokṣa*, liberation. This stance precludes the assumptions of the ritualist soteriology, though the ancestral rituals persist long after the acceptance of the philosophical notions of transmigration and its concomitant assumptions. In fact, these two soteriologies co-exist in the Dharmasūtras with no attempt to reconcile them. The Purāṇas do attempt to synthesize these two apparently contradictory ideologies, but that genre lies outside the scope of this study.

since their topic is the domestic ritual. The texts of the *dharma* literature address themselves to the Brahmin, as the paradigm of householder conduct. Since the Dharmasūtras and Dharmaśāstras are more consciously addressing the householder, the terms for householder find a more significant place and characteristics of the householder take a larger role in these texts. In the period after the composition of the Upaniṣads, the term householder certainly implies a distinction between ascetic and householder, but this sense is less immediate in the genres of Brahmanical texts discussed, because they are concerned with the householder not his counterpart, the renouncer.[2] In short, it is clear that the householder is the focal point of the ritualist thread of the Brahmanical tradition, despite the fact that his centrality to the topic of discussion is often assumed.

The Buddhist authors address the householder from a different perspective and contextualize themselves within the householder's religious life in different ways. Both traditions, however, actively construct the conception of that life and both define the householder by his ritual obligations. The manner of the fulfillment of those obligations is simply different (though not as different as one would expect from the traditional and scholarly emphasis on difference when discussing these two traditions). These two theological traditions share certain assumptions about the practices of householders. Considering the shared conception of who is a householder a preliminary definition is in order; for the purpose of this study the householder is any married man with enough disposable income to engage in religious activities; primary among his concerns in the religious realm are the cultural artifacts shared in all south Asian sub-cultures: hospitality, propitiation of the divine, and ancestor worship. This I call householder religion.

[2] For a discussion of the distinction between householder and ascetic, see Olivelle 1993.

Differentiating between religious actor and religious expert creates a useful distinction, though the matter is a bit more complex in the Indian case. In Indian religions the religious actor *par excellence* is the householder, a married man actively engaged in ritual performance. While the religious actor is merely a participant, the religious expert is a man trained in the expert traditions of his religion, a theologian. He is the author of the texts of ancient Indian religion, our sources for understanding these traditions. However, while this study employs the textual productions of the intellectual elite in each tradition, the focus remains on the householder as the object of inquiry.

While choosing to focus on the householder at the expense of the renunciate, this study divides its attention between Brahmanical and Buddhist formulations of householder religion. That divided attention, however, complicates the matter of the expert's identity. In the Brahmanical tradition the religious expert is also a religious actor, i.e., a householder, but in the Buddhist tradition the religious expert is a renouncer, i.e., a monk.[3] Whereas the Brahmanical expert is reflecting upon a tradition in which he participates, the Buddhist expert approaches the notion of the householder from a different perspective. This study employs the term expert to refer to an author from the expert intellectual tradition while remaining conscious of the fact that the Brahmanical expert occupies a dual role, as actor and expert.

The last dichotomy, the distinction between Brahmanical and Buddhist traditions, requires careful handling; my primary concern in discussing their respective theological constructions is to avoid reifying the artificial categories of Brahmanical and Buddhist. This is not to deny that such categories were employed by ideologues within both traditions to construct religious identities such as Buddhist and Brahmin; this certainly

[3] The category of *upāsaka* and *upāsikā*, complicate matters further, but a detailed discussion of this distinction is beyond the scope of my study. See Samuels (1999).

did happen, and my study is evidence of those efforts. However, the strength and utility of such categories is inversely related to their distance from such rarified philosophical applications, i.e., the further you get from the ideal constructions of identity in the most discursive texts, the less relevant and less useful these categories become. This position implies that the categories of Brahmanical and Buddhist only have any value as a means to distinguish at the theological level. Further, the discursive application of that distinction by the ideologues conceals the interrelatedness of the two intellectual traditions. In this study, I employ a distinction between Brahmanical and Buddhist tradition, only to refer to the intellectual expert traditions.

Further, the evidence from both textual traditions supports the supposition that the situation was more complex than the simple dichotomy Brahmin-Buddhist suggests. The ambiguity and fluid nature of 'influence' makes such straight-forward interpretations over-simplifications of a complex reality of social interaction. To posit that any religious conception originated in one religious tradition and was accepted by another reduces the complexity of intellectual interaction on the ideological level and ignores the fluid nature of such identities at the level of the religious actor; this is particularly true in the case of Brahmanical and Buddhist thought in the first millennium before the Common Era. Querying the early influences on the notion of *karma* and merit transfer, Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty writes:

> There was such constant interaction between Vedism and Buddhism in the early period that it is fruitless to attempt to sort out the earlier sources of many doctrines; they lived in one another's pockets, like Picasso and Braque (who were, in later years, unable to say which of them had painted certain paintings from their earlier, shared period). To postulate *śrāddha* as the "source" of transfer of merit in Buddhism is to ignore the stark chronological fact that the *śrāddha* first appears in *Gṛhyasūtras* roughly contemporaneous with Buddhism, and that many Vedic doctrines continued to develop under Buddhist influence. One can, of course, find earlier traces of merit transfer in Vedic texts, but it is impossible to isolate them and fix them in time. Rather than looking for one central "source"

> which was then embroidered by "secondary influences" like a river fed by tributary streams, it would be better to picture the intellectual fountainhead of ancient India as a watershed consisting of many streams—each one an incalculably archaic source of contributing doctrines—Vedic, Ājīvika, Jaina, Dravidian, and tribal (Doniger O'Flaherty 1999c, xvii–xviii).

The complicated interrelatedness of these two traditions during this period and the artificial nature of the distinction between Brahmanical and Buddhist religion at the level of the religious actor indicate the key role that conception of the householder had in the transformations of Indian religion. The householder was the focus of the experts' theological writings; he was a pivotal figure in the theological claims of both intellectual traditions. The institution of the householder stood at the nexus of all social interactions; thus both groups had a vested interest in defining the role of householder in such a way as to advocate their own ideological suppositions. To some extent the secondary aim of this dissertation is to justify such a perspective, i.e., to demonstrate that Householder Religion encompassed and constrained both Brahmanical and Buddhist ideological efforts and became the object of their discursive efforts to construct a social reality in such a way that they themselves were established as the authority for that socially constructed reality.

Further this study seeks to open up the boundaries between the study of Hinduism and Buddhism by demonstrating that these categories often conceal the shared assumptions and discursive efforts to construct one's social reality from those shared assumptions. Often these tensions are erased in studies that focus on one element or the other of dichotomies such as ritual and philosophy or text and practice, but this study seeks to highlight the generative power of the tension inherent in each of these dichotomies and to add to our understanding of the complex relationship between Brahmin and Buddhist experts and actors.

My argument begins with the householder, the focal point of both this study and the discursive texts interpreted. I first lay out the shared notions of the householder and his

ritual obligations found in both Brahmanical and Buddhist texts. The intellectual elite of both traditions build on this broad, shared conception of the householder and develop theological constructions of the ideal householder. Central to the Brahmanical tradition's conception of the householder are two formulations of the householder's ritual obligations: the *pañcamahāyajña*, five great sacrifices, and *tri ṛṇa*, the three debts. The Buddhist tradition also employs analogous ideological schemes in its own construction of the ideal householder. By interpreting these discursive passages and comparing both traditions' theological constructions of the householder, I seek to demonstrate the first of my theses, that the Brahmanical and Buddhist ideologues operate within the same discursive space with respect to the conception of the householder. Additionally, this evidence is used to demonstrate the centrality of ancestor worship to the householder life—only divine worship and hospitality can be considered as central to the Indian religious experience—which justifies my focus on this particular ritual obligation in the remainder of the study.

In order to support my second thesis—that both traditions sought to construct their notion of the householder to secure, among other things, the role of mediator—it is necessary to narrow the scope of my study. This thesis focuses on the ancestral rites for three reasons. First, a study of the householder's full ritual responsibilities would require more space than is available. Second, the material on ancestor worship in both traditions is rich and diverse, suggesting that the authors themselves considered ancestor worship key to defining the householder life. Additionally, The Brahmanical tradition dedicates considerably more space to these rituals in the later literature. These two facts indicate a particularly wealthy source for understanding the householder and his ritual responsibilities. Third, the texts that describe the rituals of ancestor worship demonstrate the characteristics listed above more fully in both traditions than do texts that address the

householder's other ritual obligations. Interpreting material from both traditions offers me two perspectives on this householder obligation and affords me the opportunity to speculate on life beyond the discursive material of the texts. Additionally, this affords me the opportunity to outline briefly the historical development of ancestor worship in ancient India, a task long overdue.

Examining the place of the ancestral rites in householder religion necessitates a brief historical survey of ancestor worship in Brahmanical and Buddhist traditions. This review addresses both the ancestral rites of the Vedic period in the *śrauta* rituals and the later development of the *śrāddha*, the ancestral rite that survives into the later tradition. Additionally, it demonstrates that the early Buddhist tradition preserves the practice of ancestor veneration. In the *Anguttara Nikāya* the author uses the word *saddha*, the Pāli equivalent of the Sanskrit *śrāddha*. In the *Petavatthu*, a later text from the Pāli Canon, the rites to propitiate and feed ghosts exhibit striking similarities to the *śrāddha* of the Brahmanical tradition, though the offerings are made through the mediation of monks rather than Brahmins, as in the Brahmanical practice. These evidences are marshaled to demonstrate that ancestor worship was an accepted part of life for a Buddhist householder.

The discussion of the historical development of both the householder ideal and the tradition of ancestor worship provides a foundation for my argument about the social function of the ancestral rites. This section begins with a discussion of the motives and goals of ancestor worship. A review of the rewards for performing the rites makes clear the motives for the ritual actor, i.e., patron, the householder. Further, in the *dharma* literature, the authors tie the efficacy of the ritual in attaining these goals to particular aspects of the ritual's performance, especially the qualifications of the Brahmins invited to the ritual. Thus the motives and goals are tied to the details of performing the ritual in

very specific ways, e.g., the duration of one's ancestor's stay in heaven as a function of the offering made in the ritual.

This naturally leads to a discussion of the motives of the intellectual elite who construct the ritual and the details of its performance. The key aspect of the construction of ancestral rites is the religious expert's appropriation of the role of mediator in the ritual life of the householder. Brahmin and Buddhist experts alike make a concerted effort to secure the role fulfilled in the Vedic ritual by Agni, the ritual fire, as intermediary between the human ritualist and the supernatural entities that are the object of veneration in ritual, i.e., the gods and ancestors.

In conclusion, I examine the social function of the Brahmanical and Buddhist construction of the householder ideal vis-à-vis ancestor worship. Specifically addressed are the motives for the establishment of newer, sometimes innovative, ritual institutions that took on greater prominence in the tradition subsequent to Vedic ritualism; among these motives are: 1. the establishment of one's own tradition as the proper outlet for patronage, thereby securing material support; 2. the constitution of social hierarchies that establish the experts of one's own tradition in positions to exert power over others; and 3. the introduction or reinforcement of the values of the religious expert.[4]

Understanding both the historical context of the texts interpreted and the scholarly context in the larger field of academic work on India are necessary to understand the context of this study. Further, my methodology and scholarly assumptions must be made clear. These are the aims of the remainder of the Introduction.

[4] Though I touch on the importance of inheritance only briefly, all three of these intersect with the necessary connection, which exists at least in Brahmanism, between the performance of ancestral rites and laws of inheritance.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The period of this study extends from the earliest Indian literature available to the *Mahābharata* and the *Mānavadharmaśā*stra, both of which date to the early centuries of the Common Era. The raw material for this study is the textual productions of the religious experts of the Brahmanical and Buddhist traditions. The only evidence available for a study of the theological construction of the householder and his ritual duties is the textual corpus.[5]

The oldest Brahmanical materials belong to the class of *saṃhitā* literature, consisting largely of verse material used in the liturgy of the Vedic ritual. The earliest text examined here is the *Ṛg Veda*, composed in the last few centuries of second millennium BCE in Vedic Sanskrit and compiled around 1000 BCE (Witzel 1997). Slightly younger is the *Atharva Veda*, another collection of hymns, whose purpose is more diverse. This collection includes both liturgical material and hymns, spells, and other incantations of varying application. Later *saṃhitā* texts included in this study are the *Vājasaneyi* and *Taittirīya Saṃhitās* of the Yajur Veda. These are collections of *mantras* employed in the ritual draw upon the *Ṛg Veda*, but they also contain unique *mantras* used in later rituals. They are included because they contain the most relevant data about the details of and motives behind the performance of ancestor worship. The four principal Saṃhitās, the *Ṛk*, *Yajus*, *Sāma*, and *Atharva*, engender traditions of their own that preserve the liturgical material found in these texts. Around these texts form *śākhās*, or schools, that preserve the texts and, eventually, produce other genres of texts that reflect upon and react to the

[5] Archaeological evidence for the religious lives of the people who lived in the period of this study is very rare. The evidence for the ritual lives is almost non-existent, because the rituals are ephemeral experiences that leave no trace of their practice for us to examine. Since this study focuses on the rituals of ancestor worship the archaeological evidence is of little help.

ritual tradition. Texts used in this study are illustrated in Table 1, by Saṃhitā vertically and genre horizontally.

The Brāhmaṇas, prose reflections on the Vedic ritual composed, for the most part, in the first half of the first millennium BCE contain both descriptions of ritual procedures—sometimes quite detailed—and commentarial reflections on the meaning and import of those rituals.[6] The authors combine mythic explanations of the origins of the rituals with detailed procedural descriptions of the Vedic rituals. This study includes citations from the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, and the *Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa*. These four texts are employed because they offer the most detail about the ancestral rites. Of these the *Kauṣītaki* and the *Aitareya* are older, but they offer few remarks on the ritual. Because the *Śatapatha* and *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*s, on the other hand, offer extended treatments, I rely more heavily on these two texts. Other Brāhmaṇas, e.g., the *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*, offer even less information about these rituals, thus they find no place in this study. It is not surprising that the texts with the most detail occur in the *śākhās* of the *Yajur Veda*, since this Veda was concerned most with the procedural details of the ritual.

Saṃhitā	Brāhmaṇa	Śrautasūtra	Gṛhyasūtra	Dharmasūtra
Ṛk	Aitareya	Āśvalāyana	Āśvalāyana	Vasiṣṭha
	Kauṣītaki	Śankhāyana	Śankhāyana	
Taittirīya	Taittirīya	Āpastamba Baudhāyana Hiraṇyakeśin	Āpastamba Baudhāyana Hiraṇyakeśin	Āpastamba Baudhāyana Hiraṇyakeśin
Vājasaneyi	Śathapatha	Kātyāyana	Pāraskara	
Sāma	Mantra		Gobhila	Gautama

Table 1: Vedic and post-Vedic texts used in this study organized by *śākhā*.

[6] For more on the Brāhmaṇas see Eggeling's Introduction to the *Śatapatha Brahmaṇa* (Eggeling 1882); for the function of interpretation of the Vedic ritual as found in the Brāhmaṇas, see Smith 1989.

The Āraṇyakas and Upaniṣads, philosophical reflections on the ritual, offer no new insight into the ancestral rites.[7] These texts are little concerned with ancestor rites, and the latter works of this genre express a different soteriology based on reincarnation, a scheme that explicitly denies the acquisition of an enduring heaven through ritual (See Bodewitz 1966). For these reasons, these texts occupy a small space in this thesis.

Later authors within each *śākhā* documented the ritual in greater detail in the Śrautasūtras. These ritual manuals were composed between the middle and the end of the first millennium BCE. The *śrauta* texts comprise the earliest layer of the Kalpasūtras, encyclopedic collections of rituals that generally have three divisions: the Śrautasūtras, manuals that describe the older, public Vedic rituals; the Gṛhyasūtras, that outline the domestic rituals performed by the householder in his own domestic ritual fire; and the Dharmasūtras, normative treatises on *dharma*, which has been variously translated as Law, religion, or custom.[8] All the *sūtra* literature is composed in the *sūtra* style, highly attenuated prose that emphasizes the brevity of the instructions over almost any other criterion. The later Kalpasūtras, e.g., that of Āpastamba, appear to have been composed as a whole; others are the product of *śākhās* compiling material that fits into this genre. This study draws heavily on all three genres of the Kalpasūtras; the *śrauta* and *gṛhya* texts describe the ritual itself and give us clues to the intentions of the author and the ritualist performing the rites, while the *dharma* texts provide insights into how ancestor worship was situated in these early formulations of *dharma*.

[7] The few mentions of ancestral rites in the Upaniṣads, largely follow the Brāhmaṇas' treatment, frequently merely as a trope expressing the completeness of one's knowledge of the ritual world. These passages are addressed in Chapter 2.

[8] For more on the term *dharma*, see Vol. 32 no. 5–6 of the *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, a special issue dedicated to that term.

Eventually a class of religious experts authored texts that did not fit into the *śākhā* division of textual production. Some argue that the conception of *dharma* as applicable to all de-emphasized the importance of the *śākhās* (Olivelle 2000, 3). Regardless of the cause, new literature arose that spoke to more universal claims to authority and the universal applicability of *dharma*. This movement began with the composition of the Dharmasūtras, but the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*—an early Dharmaśāstra, treatise on Law, composed sometime between the second and third centuries CE (Olivelle 2005, 25)—is the best example of this new literature. It marks the beginning of an intellectual tradition that addressed *dharma* and *vyavahāra*, legal codes, that continued for centuries.[9] This study does not address those later works since they rapidly increase in number and represent a more fundamental shift in the approach to the rituals under consideration here. Another text concerned with *dharma* that will enter this discussion is the great Indian epic, the *Mahābhārata*. There is scholarly consensus that this enormous work of bardic poetry came into its present form around the first century BCE (Hiltebeitel 2001, 18–20). I take advantage of the encyclopedic nature of this epic to highlight the place of ancestor worship in the period which ends this study.

The Buddhist material is far less extensive, both in time span and in volume. Most likely the Pāli Canon, the earliest collection of Buddhist texts, we have available today is a reflection of the canon first written down in the first century BCE (Norman 1983, 5). There was certainly a long period of development before its commitment to writing (von Hinüber 1996, 5), but the manner and degree of success in preservation is a controversial subject. Some argue for a considerable amount of influence from Pāli grammarians of the

[9] The *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* certainly does not represent the earliest compositions on these matters—the Dharmasūtras discuss *dharma* and the *Arthaśāstra* discusses *vyavahāra* extensively, and Manu is certainly indebted to both—but the genre of Dharmaśāstra is popularized by Manu and the manner in which the topics are addressed in the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* becomes the paradigm for the genre.

twelfth century (Norman 1983, 6); others suggest we can know little for certain of the Pāli Canon before the redaction known to Buddhaghosa in the fifth or sixth century CE (Schopen 1997, 24). It is difficult to accept this level of skepticism, since other material datable to a period before the fifth century CE demonstrates an awareness of the Pāli Canon.[10] From the Pāli Canon I draw primarily upon texts of the *Sutta Piṭaka*, and the choice of the material reflects the available sources that evidence concern over the ancestors and their propitiation.

In addition to several *suttas* from the four older Nikāyas, the *Saṃyutta Nikāya*, the *Anguttara Nikāya*, the *Dīgha Nikāya*, and the *Majjhima Nikāya*, I draw upon the *Petavatthu*, a collection of ghost stories from the *Kuddaka Nikāya* aimed at warning the readers about the dangers of immoral behavior. These didactic tales aim to reinforce the religious practice of giving, particularly to the Saṅgha, the Buddhist monastic community, but they can be read with an eye to revealing cultural assumptions about and practices aimed at the deceased. The *Petavatthu* exists today imbedded in its commentary, the *Paramatthadīpanī* of Dhammapāla. The *Petavatthu* dates to around the second century BCE (Obeyesekere 2002, 139), but the commentary of Dhammapāla dates to somewhere around the seventh century CE (Cousins 1972, 159).[11] These texts are most relevant to my argument and demonstrate that *śrāddha* did have a significant place in the Buddhist engagement with householders.

The texts from the Pāli Canon grant us a perspective on the earliest expressions of Buddhism. Though their exact chronological provenance is unclear, they are roughly

[10] For example, consider the *Petavatthu*, which I use in this work. This does not, however, rule out modifications after this period, but most of the material would have been fixed in a recognizable form.
[11] The dating of Dhammapāla is very complex. In fact, Cousins posits three different authors for the works generally ascribed to Dhammapāla, one in the sixth century, one probably in the seventh century CE, and the last circa 960 CE (Cousins 1972, 163 and passim).

coeval with the primary Brahmanical sources and this grants us the ability to compare the ideological schemes and relate the discursive efforts of the authors of both traditions.

SCHOLARLY CONTEXT

This dissertation draws upon several scholarly traditions, thus the scholarly context of this study is complex. Traditionally scholars of Buddhism do little more than nod to the influence of Hinduism, or speak of Vedic context. Those who study Hinduism similarly reify the disciplinary distinctions by conceptualizing Buddhism as a heterodox offshoot of Hinduism. While this characterization is admittedly hyperbolic, advocates of both disciplines tend to obscure the interpenetrating nature of the two traditions. Additionally, the topic of ancestor worship among scholars of Brahmanical religion has received little treatment. Consequently, the broader collection of works on ancestor worship includes very little work on ancestral veneration in the Indian context, despite the rich tradition of ancestor worship in Hinduism and Buddhism.[12] At best Indian traditions receive a few paragraphs that oversimplify Indian ancestral traditions; at worst the treatments are full of anachronisms or downright incorrect accounts.[13]

[12] Admittedly ancestor worship is far less central to early Buddhism than to ancient Brahmanical religion, but the connections highlighted in this dissertation have been ignored, or merely used instrumentally for other ends (see O'Flaherty 1999b and McDermott 1999 and my discussion of the search for the origins of the doctrine of the transference of merit below, fn. 18), in the literature to date.

[13] Helen Hardacre's entry in the *Encyclopedia of Religion, Second Edition* illustrates this well. Her review of the 'Ancestor Worship in the History of the Study of Religion' cites no source that addresses any Indian religions. Her single paragraph on 'India' mentions only one ritual of the many that exist and only in one historical period, more specifically one text, the *Laws of Manu*. Her section on 'Buddhism' is sparse and largely gives the impression that ancestor worship is central to Buddhism only in East Asia. Finally, her bibliography lists no work, not even one of the most widely cited anthologies, that gives more than a single line mention to Indian or Hindu conceptions or rituals of ancestor worship (Hardacre 2005, 322). Incidentally, the only mention in Newell's influential *Ancestors* is misleading, at best (Newell 1976, 19). W. Crooke's entry in the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* provides more detail to ancestor worship in India, but this is to be expected, since he is a scholar of Indian religion (Crooke 1908). But this work commits the same error as other works in the field, that of accepting the classical formulation as the only formulation; he fails to treat the older *śrauta* rite at all. Like Hardacre, the earliest source he cites is the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*. For more on such anachronisms see my discussion of the Buddhologists' characterization of *śrāddha* below in connection to its influence on the doctrine of the transfer of merit in Buddhism, fn. 18.

In addition to producing a study of householder religion and a historical study of ancestor worship in ancient India, this work aims to break down some of these barriers, to open new avenues of inquiry across the divisions between scholastic disciplines and to suggest a new perspective that may illumine the data in new ways. But this work would be impossible without the valuable existing scholarship in all these areas of study. Central to my efforts is the scholarly work on the religion of the householder.

Householder Religion

The defining characteristic of the householder is the obligation to engage in ritual. Consequently, the majority of material available to illuminate the practices of and ideas about the householder occurs in the context of ritual. Most of the primary material available from the Vedic period discussed above is ritual in nature: the Vedas are liturgical, the Brāhmaṇas are reflections on ritual, the Śrautasūtras and Gṛhyasūtras are ritual manuals. Only the Upaniṣads and Āraṇyakas represent a voice less concerned with ritual, though they are not completely silent on ritual. The most valuable of the scholarly works are the editions of texts; they grant us access to the compositions of the religious experts, our most valuable window into the religions of ancient India.

The next class of materials that are useful in accessing the ritual lives of the householder are the encyclopedic studies of ritual. A considerable amount of work has been produced on the details of the Vedic ritual; most valuable are the commentaries, both traditional and scholarly, that accompany the texts. This work directly informs the handling of the older ancestral rites in the following study. Entire volumes have been dedicated to individual ritual cycles (e.g., Bhide 1979, Einoo 1988, and Thite 1975). These scholarly reviews are also invaluable to understanding the context. Most valuable of these is P. V. Kane's *History of Dharmaśāstra*, which provides a great amount of detail and many references for the rituals of the householder.

The work done on the ancestral rites in Brahmanical religion generally occupies a small place in some larger study, most often a few pages in a volume on Vedic ritual (e.g., Hillebrandt 1897, 114–115 and 118). Occasionally, an article will appear in an anthology; among these David Knipe's (1999) "Sapiṇḍīkarana: The Hindu Rite of Entry into Heaven" stands out as a valuable piece of scholarship. Marcelle Saindon (1999) and Erik Reenberg Sand (1986) also address the importance of *śrāddha*. But these latter works, and the few others like them (e.g., Chemburkar 1987, Donner 1987), are limited in one respect: they restrict their discussion of ancestor worship to the *śrāddha* as it occurs in classical Hinduism.[14] All these studies fail to address, in any detail, the older history of the *śrāddha* of the Gṛhyasūtras and the older tradition of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* and the *pitṛyajña*, rituals of ancestor worship of the Vedic period.[15] I do not mean here to diminish the importance of the later tradition, and indeed there are considerably more resources for studying the Purāṇic period (as did Saindon and Sand) and even more if one looks at that period and the contemporary tradition (as did Knipe). Studies that focus on a single text or genre (as Chemburkar did with the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*) certainly add to our knowledge, but the sum of these studies does not do justice to an important aspect of the Brahmanical tradition.[16]

Two book length studies have tried to address the historical development of ancestor worship: Willem Caland's *Altindischer Ahnencult: Das Çrāddha nach den verschiedenen Schulen mit Benutzung handschriftlicher Quellen* and Dakshina Ranjan Shastri's *Origin and Development of the Rituals of Ancestor Worship in India*. As his title indicates,

[14] Though Knipe does discuss the older rituals, he does so only to explicate the cosmology that is, by nature of the genre, omitted from the later texts.

[15] Further, of these only Knipe mentions the most obvious curiosity of the *śrāddha*, particularly in the later context in which all of these authors discuss it, that there is a fundamental opposition between the soteriology of the *śrāddha* and the soteriology of *karma* and *mokṣa* (1999, 112).

[16] Knipe too laments the lack of study of the Hindu rites of ancestor worship, "It is one of the great spiritual dramas of men. And yet it is one of the least studied aspects of Hinduism" (1999, 112).

Caland focuses his attention on the *śrāddha*, drawing upon the Śrautasūtras and the Gṛhyasūtras. While he does address the older ancestral rites briefly—roughly five pages of his two-hundred-sixty page volume—it is in the service of explaining the *śrāddha*. Shastri too dedicates only a few pages to the Vedic rites, also drawing on the Śrautasūtras, but he too uses these sources to illumine his discussion of the *śrāddha*.

In short, the scholarly work on ancestor worship in the Brahmanical tradition primarily addresses the *śrāddha*. Those works that do mention the older Vedic rituals fail to significantly address the transition from the Vedic *piṇḍapitṛyajña* and *pitṛyajña* to the *śrāddha* of the latter tradition. Worst, some scholars insist on referring to the "Vedic *śrāddha*" (e.g., Egge 2002, 31, McDermott 1977, 462) or making more of references in the *Ṛg Veda* than the evidence supports (e.g., Poleman 1934; Doniger 1981, 48). Some even foreshorten the tradition, implying that the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* is the oldest source on ancestral rites (e.g., Crooke 1908, 452 and Hardarce 2005, 322). While studies of ancestor worship in general are few and far between, a critical study of the older, Vedic model of ancestor worship and its relationship to the *śrāddha* tradition is completely absent.

This lack of scholarship is paralleled in the field of Buddhist studies; among scholars of Buddhism the study of ancestor worship is usually restricted to East Asia.[17] The scholarship on Buddhism falls into two categories: those that contextualize the texts and those that try to address the connection between Buddhist practice and ancestor worship.

The former is rich and invaluable in understanding the texts from which I draw data. On the broad scale Norman's (1983) and von Hinüber's (1996) overviews of Pāli

[17] Robert Smith's (1974) *Ancestor Worship in Contemporary Japan* is considered a seminal work on the topic. Also consider Newell's (1976a) *Ancestors*, a classic for ancestor worship, which has two articles that address Buddhism and ancestor worship in Japan.

literature has helped contextualize the sources. Masefield's (in Dhammapāla 1989) introduction to the *Petavatthu* goes far beyond introducing this text, and his insights into the context of this text and the implications for such a study as mine have been critical to proving my theses. More specifically with respect to ancestor worship, the *śrāddha* does find a place in several works on the development of the notion of the transfer of merit in Buddhism (Egge 2002, Heim 2004, Holt 1981, Masefield in Dhammapāla 1989, McDermott 1999, Doniger O'Flaherty1999a. See also Amore 1971), though these authors are more concerned about the influence of the concepts involved in filial piety than in the history of the ritual itself or the place of rituals of ancestor worship in the lives of Buddhist householders.[18] At least one author makes similar connections to those made in

[18] In fact, I think these efforts are frequently very problematic, at least in the specifics of a connection to the *śrāddha*. In summing up the "doctrinal bearings" of the stories in the *Petavatthu*, Law writes "According to the Hindu idea the gifts are to be made to a Brahmin in person or even a substitute for a *Brāhmaṇa*, and the merit depends upon the number of people fed and clothed on behalf of the spirit. The fruit of the deeds is transferred to the spirit. In the Hindu *śrāddha*, some articles of food and clothing are of course offered directly to the spirit, but they must be given away to a deserving man in order that the desired results may be produced" (1936, 106). This is not an accurate account of the *śrāddha*, in either the Brahmanical or Buddhist accounts. In both, as will be shown below, the food etc. is offered to the intermediary on behalf of the deceased. Further, in the older tradition, which one could argue may have had more influence on the Buddhist tradition; these offerings are made without an intermediary. Without an explicit mention of some transfer, which is absent in both contexts, it is difficult to imply such. But McDermott asserts "The connection with *śrāddha* rites is spelled out in B. C. Law, *The Buddhist Conception of Spirits*" (1999, 190 fn. 86), and many other scholars have simply accepted this.

The garbling of the facts persists, consider this statement by Charles F. Keyes: "The Buddhist conception of merit-transference represents a reworking of the pre-Buddhistic Indian practice of *śraddhā* (Pāli *saddhā*), entailing the offering of food and other goods for use by the dead" (Keyes 1983, 281). Keyes not only accepts Law's problematic assertion as true, but uses the wrong word to refer to the Brahmanical ritual. Additionally, characterizing the *śrāddha* as 'pre-Buddhistic' presents other problems. Even if we read him generously and assume he means that the rite originated before Buddhism arose, there is the problem of the historical development of the *śrāddha*, which is still underway in the Ghṛya Sūtras as late as the second or third centuries BCE, as I will show below. Thus the temporal relationship of the two traditions is much more complex than he allows, even if we neglect the fact that we are unable to satisfactorily determine the relative chronologies of the Brahmanical and Buddhist texts let alone the influences between them.

Despite the fact that scholars of Buddhism seem comfortable with accepting Law's statement without reconsidering it in its context, there may be some connection between the *śrāddha* and the transfer of merit, but I suggest that the relationship is much more complex than these scholars seem willing to accept. Heim (2004), who addresses this issue in the context of *dāna*, gifting or prestation, seems to appreciate the complex influences of this time period with greater subtlety.

this dissertation. P. D. Premasiri (1991) points out the significance of ancestor worship to the Buddhists of the Pāli canon, but he fails to do more than indicate it was a practice given some credence by those authors. The focus of scholars of Indian Buddhism has been elsewhere; their focus has been on the Buddhist elements of the texts, how the Buddhists are differentiating themselves from the Brahmins. But the ways that the Buddhist authors chose to remain the same are often as important as the ways they chose to differ. Retaining key rituals must have been significant in attracting loyal patrons.

The householder's status as a ritualist found opposition sometime in the middle of the first millennium BCE. A tradition arose that advocated the renunciation of the world and this distinction strengthened in the hands of the scholars of Hinduism. According to Louis Dumont, "the secret of Hinduism may be found in the dialogue between the renouncer and the man-in-the-world" (1960, 37). And while the sharp distinction that Dumont made between the renouncer and the man-in-the-world has come under fire (e.g., Heesterman 1982, 252) and his characterization of the relationship between these two groups as a binary opposition is problematic (Thapar 1982, 274), the tension between the renouncer and the ritualist has certainly been a productive one in the Brahmanical tradition. Thapar has shown that the debate over renunciation was of central importance to both the Brahmanical and Buddhist tradition (1982). The *āśrama* system, a central component of classical Hinduism, is, in large part, a development of this very debate (Thapar 1982, 274; Olivelle 1993, 58ff). And most often the life of the householder is explored in light of this tension, in opposition to renunciation. The present study draws upon the insights of these works to deepen our understanding of the householder, not in contrast to the renunciate, but as a legitimate norm of its own right.

Despite the tendency to understand the householder in contrast to the renunciate, the secondary literature on the householder is rich and presents a fertile ground from which

this study grows. Again, the encyclopedic nature of P. V. Kane's *History of Dharmaśāstra* is very useful in understanding the householder and his obligations. However, like the secondary literature on the ancestral rites, most valuable work on the householder and his obligations appears as a part of larger studies or anthologies. The sum of this work is a detailed picture of the intersection of renunciate and householder and the key aspects of householder ideology (e.g., purity and auspiciousness in Carman and Marglin 1985). Prominent among the book length studies of the householder's life is Patrick Olivelle's (1993) *The Āśrama System*. This book outlines the discursive arguments within the Brahmanical tradition over the householder's life and has helped contextualize the ritual life of the householder, which has been invaluable in this work.

One aspect of the study of the householder and his religious obligations that falls short of expectations is the treatment of the intersection of Hindu and Buddhist conceptions of the householder. The little work that has been done in this area is limited to one aspect of a larger study (e.g., in contemporary Nepal, Gellner 1992). The present study aims to draw upon the resources in both traditions to redress this lack.

Ancestor Worship

Despite the decided lack of attention that Indian religions have received in the study of ancestor worship, the study of the ancestral rites in the Brahmanical and Buddhist traditions is enriched by consulting the insights found in studies of ancestor worship in different cultures and cross cultural studies of ancestor worship. Classic works that focus on ancestor worship offer examples and methods for identifying the social mechanisms of the ancestral rites. Jack Goody's (1962) *Death, Property and the Ancestors*, for example, describes the history of the study of ancestor and mortuary rites and presents an interpretive model for interpreting these rituals. Peter Metcalf's (1982) insight into the cosmological significance and place of the ancestors, though in the context of Borneo,

has parallels in the study of the 'celestial' and the 'terrestrial' Pitṛs of the Brahmanical tradition. Anthologies like *Ancestors* (Newell 1976a) bring together diverse examples and generate discussions that further the usefulness of disparate modes of ancestor worship. In the introductory remarks of that volume, Meyer Fortes and William Newell reflect on the field of ancestor worship and suggest parameters that suggest avenues of comparison (Fortes 1976; Newell 1976b). In her volume on ancestor worship in ancient Maya society, Patricia McAnany (1995) further nuances arguments about overlap and heuristic usefulness of such categories as veneration, worship, and commemoration. Her discussion in particular reminds one of the artificiality of these categories and the need to continually reevaluate them. Further she underlines the indebtedness of the field to works on kinship and lineage.

Throughout all these works one finds useful model and tools. Arnold van Gennep's concept of *rites de passage* is integral to most of these scholars' analysis and invaluable to describing the function of rituals such as the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa*, the transition from disembodied dead person to ancestor. Goody's (1962) discussion of connection of inheritance and ancestors in West Africa offers a parallel analytical framework with which to approach the Brahmanical ideology of the three debts, which also blurs the line between material and spiritual inheritance. Metcalf's (1982) analysis of food and hair as codes of separation in Borneo presents an interpretive model that illuminates similar social functions operative in the death impurity separation practices of Hinduism (Cf. Mines 1990). In short, the work on ancestor worship, though largely located in Africa and East Asia, informs the study of ancestor worship in India in two primary ways: 1. it offers models for interpreting the complex interface of ritual, society, and family-centered filial piety, and 2. it offers examples from different cultures that illuminate the process of

finding a place among the living for those who have died, through commemoration, memorialization, and ritual interaction.

To sum up, this dissertation is indebted to the rich works that have been done in all three areas of study, but draws upon the works of each with the aim of fundamentally rethinking the distinctions that separate them. Only by recognizing that Brahmins and Buddhists "lived in each other's pockets", as Doniger O'Flaherty says, can we begin to make sense of the complex nature of the relationship between the religious experts of these two traditions and the householder, who sometimes transcends these categories altogether.

METHODOLOGY

At its most basic this dissertation is based on a careful reading of the texts available for the period under discussion. The most important factor that constrains a careful reading of the texts is the discursive nature of the texts.

All texts are composed in particular contexts with the author's particular interests in mind; by remaining aware of these factors one can more carefully mine the text for clues as to social reality, otherwise you run the risk of misreading a prescriptive text as a descriptive text. The Brahmanical texts were all composed with the aim of advancing one particular point of view; some advocate the ideologies and practices of the ascetic movement, others argue for the ritually active life of the householder. When reading the latter, in which most of my evidence is found, one cannot forget that these are theological texts arguing for a particular view of reality. The Buddhist texts too have particular aims in mind when they describe the practices of householders in their texts, most often a re-appropriation/re-imagination of traditional ritual practices with a Buddhists ideological mindset. If a scholar is careful, he or she can read between the lines and find some clues about the culture upon which the author is reflecting.

My study walks a thin line between two pitfalls: ascribing objective reality to the scholastic reflections of an intellectual elite and remaining at the rarified ideological level of 'doctrine.' While it is true that we cannot get to the reality of the social experience of ancient South Asia, the ideological reflections on practice that we interpret can give us a fairly good idea of the world in which the authors lived. This is especially true with respect to the object of my study, since the authors of the Brahmanical texts are householders themselves; they offer us a reflection on their own lives. The principle of *obiter dicta* allows us to "read between the lines" as Jamison does in her study of women in the Vedic ritual cycle (Jamison 1996). The small clues of social reality that authors let slip can give us some idea of the social reality of ancient householder religion. Additionally, we are dealing with a subject matter that is the stuff of everyday life. These are not philosophical treatises on the nature of the self or abstract conceptions of reality; these are normative texts aimed at effecting change in the world. As such they have a particularly close relationship to the reality they reflect. In that reflection, we are able to gain some sense of the social reality in which the texts were composed.

CHAPTER OUTLINE

Since a directly chronological approach would involve a great deal of difficulty—largely because our understanding of earlier traditions is usually predicated on descriptions composed much later—in general this dissertation moves from the general to the specific, from the known to the speculative, necessarily abandoning a strictly chronological approach.

Chapter 1 reviews both Brahmanical and Buddhist reflections on the householders' obligations and outlines ideological construction of the householder. This discussion also demonstrates the centrality of ancestor worship to conception of the householder life in both ideological traditions. Three key ideas are central to the construction of the

householder: the Brahmanical notions of the five great sacrifices and the triple debt and the Buddhist conception of the *pañca bali*. The primary aim of this chapter is to show that the Brahmin and Buddhist authors occupied the same discursive space. Secondarily, the evidence reviewed is used to show the centrality of ancestor worship to the conception of a householder, which supports my use of the ancestral rites to prove my second thesis, that both traditions construct the ritual obligations of the householder in such a way as to secure for themselves, among other things, the role of mediator between the householder and various supernatural entities.

Chapter 2 sets the stage for my second thesis by outlining the historical development of the ancestor rites in both the Brahmanical and Buddhist traditions. This review begins with the *śrauta* rites described in the Brāhmaṇas and Śrautasūtras then moves to speculate on the older material of the *Ṛg Veda* and *Atharva Veda*. Next are reviewed the domestic rituals that, though much older in origin, first find expression in the Gṛhyasūtras. The final Brahmanical material included in the historical review is the *dharma* literature, discussions of *dharma*—Law, religion, duty—including the Dharmasūtras and the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*, the most influential law book of ancient India and passages from the *Mahābhārata*, the long Indian Epic. Finally, evidence from the Buddhist texts finds a place in the historical outline. Passages from Buddhist texts demonstrate that ancestor worship had a central place in the Buddhist imagination of the householder's religious obligations. This chapter lays the foundation for the last two chapters.

Chapters 3 and 4 address the aims and functions of ancestor worship for both the Brahmins and Buddhists. Among these I address the internal discussions of aims, goals, rewards, and rationale for performing ancestor worship and the modern scholarly view of the social function of ancestor worship. Chapter 3 describes the traditional expressions of

the reasons for performing the ancestral rites and the concerns for the proper execution of a successful *śrāddha* that consume the authors of the *dharma* texts; central to these authors' concerns are the duration of the offerings and the proper characteristics of one to be invited to the ritual as guest. These concerns are central to the social function described in the last chapter, as the authors advocated their own role in the rituals of ancestor worship through these rules of performance. Chapter 4 addresses the primary social function of the ancestral rites: mediation. In the earlier period the ritual fire acted as mediator between the sacrificer and the gods and other supernatural entities; Agni conveyed oblations to both the gods and the Pitṛs, in fact Agni even transported the dead to the next world. In the later period the Brahmin took the role of mediator in the Brahmanical tradition (in a special case of this role, most clearly in the *śrāddha*, the Brahmins stand in for the Pitṛs and accept oblations on their behalf). In the Buddhist tradition, the Saṅgha becomes the mediator; gifts bear fruit only when bestowed on the Saṅgha and, more significantly, the offerings to *petas*, the deceased, are only effective if dedicated to the *peta* and given to the Saṅgha. The exchange of a divine fire for a human agent as mediator is a significant aspect of understanding this new model of religious practice in South Asia and it appears most clearly in the ancestor rites of the householder.

The Conclusion addresses some of the motives that may underlie the social functions discussed, particularly as they relate to the transition from the Vedic religion to the formative stages of Hinduism. Finally, I drawn together the parts of the argument and summarize the dissertation.

Chapter 1: The Householder

The focal point of this study is the householder and my first chapter introduces this central religious actor. This chapter begins by locating the householder in his social context in order to better understand his role. But, more important than who a householder is and is not, is what he does, since the defining characteristic of a householder in the texts available to us is just that, his actions, specifically, his ritual obligations. Ritual is central not only to the Vedic religious life, but to Classical Hinduism, whose religious development is germinal in the Gṛhyasūtras and comes to full bloom in the Purāṇas. The domestic rituals that find expression in the Gṛhyasūtras lay the foundation for ritual practices that endure into contemporary Hinduism. The Pāli Canon too attests a variety of ritual activities common for the Buddhist householder; most frequently the rituals are accepted as a part of householder life, though the Buddha usually modifies the import of those rituals to advocate a new ideological perspective on ritual practice.[19]

The discussion of the householder and his obligations begins with passages from both traditions that describe a shared conception of the householder's ritual obligations. This conception of the householder is then contextualized within the framework of the Brahmanical and Buddhist theological constructions of the householder. These constructions are best dealt with in two groups: 1. those that define the householder's obligations by categorizing rituals and 2. those that revolve around debt as a metaphor for his ritual obligations. The first includes the *pañcamahāyajña*, the (doctrine) of five great sacrifices; the '*huta* scheme', an analogous categorization of certain rituals; and the

[19] The *Jāṇussoṇisutta*, which I discuss in Chapter 2, is but one example of a very common theme in the Pāli Canon.

pañca bali, a set of five offerings made by householders. The second appears in the Brahmanical literature as the doctrine of the three debts, a list of ritual obligations conceived of as debts to supernatural entities, and is paralleled in the Buddhist literature, though without as doctrinal a formulation. In the case of the former, the historical development of these ideological systems is reviewed and it is shown that, in the Brahmanical tradition, it culminated in the homologization of the *pañcamahāyajña* and the '*huta* scheme' in the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*. A similar review follows for the notion of debt as a metaphor for ritual obligation. In the end this chapter uses this evidence to demonstrate two points central to my thesis. First, it shows that the Brahmanical and Buddhist sources share basic assumptions about the ritual obligations of the householder and occupy the same discursive space in their efforts to engage those assumptions in the ideological construction of the 'proper householder'. Further, it demonstrates that ancestor worship is central to the conception of the householder, a fact that supports my decision to use ancestor worship as the evidence to prove my second thesis: that both traditions sought to construct their notion of the householder to secure, among other things, the role of mediator.

THE HOUSEHOLDER

The householder, *gṛhapati* in Sanskrit and *gahapati* in Pāli, for the purposes of this study is defined as any married man with enough disposable income to engage in religious activities. Primary among his concerns in the religious realm are the cultural artifacts shared in all south Asian sub-cultures: hospitality, propitiation of the divine, and ancestor worship. This first section addresses the identity of the householder and the negotiated identities in ancient India to contextualize the religious actor who is the focus of this study. With that done, I turn to the definition of the householder by his ritual obligations.

Three primary identities concern me in an attempt to sketch the householder's context, specifically with respect the variety of identities that men in ancient India assumed. The first is the social identity defined by one's *varṇa*, class, or *jāti*, caste. Of primary importance to the authors of the texts examined in this study is the former, *varṇa*. The second axis of identity is between householder and renouncer. The householder advocates and lives a life in the world, actively engaging in ritual, while the renouncer abandons the life in the world and eschews ritual performance. The final distinction is between Brahmanical and Buddhist religious identity. This distinction has been discussed in the Introduction. These identities fall along different axes: the *varṇa* system is a social institution, which maintains a hierarchy that is universally recognized in India (Olivelle 1993, 26); the distinction between householder and renouncer is both a practical distinction—since they are being distinguished by their behavior—and a theological distinction—as is apparent in the *āśrama* system, which develops in the context of the contestation between these two religious lifestyles—and the distinction between Brahmin and Buddhist is an ideological difference that operates most clearly at rarefied level of the intellectual discourse of the religious elites who compose texts and engage in world construction.[20] Additionally, these identities are relatively independent factors and are, for the most part, not mutually exclusive.

By this I mean to say that the role of householder is not limited to any of the *varṇas* nor to one or the other of the religious identities. While the Brahmanical texts were aimed at Brahmin householders, and the Pāli Canon frequently identifies a protagonist as a *brāhmaṇagahapatika*, a Brahmin householder, there were certainly householders of other

[20] With respect to the last I am thinking of Peter Berger's (1967) and Gary Lease's (1994) reflections on the construction of social reality and diffusion of culture respectively.

varṇas, the many kings who host the Buddha in the Pāli Canon are but one example.[21] Likewise the distinction between householder and renouncer does not correlate to either of the other identity axes, i.e., there are ascetics of each *varṇa* and both Brahmin and Buddhist renouncers. In short, householder is a category that cuts across the other two categories of identity, *varṇa* and religious group identity. Further, it must be pointed out that because texts of both traditions address themselves primarily to the householders of the *brāhmaṇa varṇa*, i.e., Brahmins, the picture drawn from these sources is a Brahmanical self-reflection. Consequently, we are limited in what we know about what Brahmins actually did and looked like and what members of other *varṇas* thought of these reflections. With this sketch of the social context of the householder's identity, i.e., who he is, I now turn to what he does, another measure of who the householder is.

The efforts to create a picture of the householder from the texts have specific constraints; all the texts that illumine the religious life of ancient India are discursive in nature and thus require careful attention to the lens through which the author sees the world. But the degree to which a text distorts that upon which it reflects is variable. The principle of *obiter dicta* tells us that in an argument about one social concern an author may reflect uncritically on another aspect of his cultural milieu. Two such passages are the topic of this first section.

The *Dhanañjānisutta* of the *Majjhima Nikāya* includes a vivid picture of a common householder's obligations. A monk visits Sāriputta and asks about the condition of several people: Sāriputta, the Saṅgha, and a Brahmin named Dhanañjāni. After finding

[21] Here it seems appropriate to make a distinction between householder as a designation for a married man who engages in religious rituals (*gṛhapati*) and the householder *āśrama* (*gṛhastha*), which is a theological category that operates within the confines of the Brahmanical tradition. The difference is analogous to the difference between marriage and the sacrament of marriage. As the Catholic church may fail to recognize a civil marriage, so a Brahmin ideologue may fail to recognize a Śūdra who engages in religious ritual as occupying the householder *āśrama*. Throughout this work I use the term householder in its broader compass and not to refer to the householder *āśrama*.

out that all are well, he asks if the Brahmin is being *appamatto*. The term is a privative of the negative quality *pamatta*, which has a broad semantic range, including: slothful, indolent, indifferent, careless, negligent, inconsiderate, and heedless. The term *appamatto*, then, means careful, diligent, or considerate and in this context, as will be seen, it carries a moral quality, one could say 'morally careful;' I will use Horner's diligent. In response to the curious monk Sāriputta replies that Dhanañjāni is not being diligent:

> Kuto no āvuso, dhanañjānissa brāhmaṇassa appamādo? Dhanañjāni āvuso, brāhmaṇo rājānaṃ nissāya brāhmaṇagahapatike vilumpati. brāhmaṇagahapatike nissāya rājānaṃ vilumpati. Yāpissa bhariyā saddhā saddhākulā ānītā, sāpissa kālakatā, añña'ssa bhariyā assaddhā assaddhākulā ānītā'ti. *M* ii.185
>
> How, brother, could the Brahmin Dhanañjāni be diligent? Dhanañjāni, brother, having the support of the king robs the Brahmin householders. Having the support of the Brahmin householders he robs the king. His wife, who had a spirit of hospitality (*saddhā*) and brought from a family who had a spirit of hospitality, died; he brought another wife who was without the spirit of hospitality from a family without the spirit of hospitality.[22]

Sāriputta asks how such a man could be diligent and comments upon his behavior as it related to his character. The first descriptor clearly indicates that Dhanañjāni[23] somehow usurps the king's authority to take advantage of the Brahmin householders[24] and vice versa, i.e., he supports himself by immoral means. The second, with regard to his

[22] Unless otherwise noted, all translations are mine.

[23] The name Dhānañjāni translates roughly as plunder of wealth, indicative of both his occupation and the moral of the story.

[24] While the *Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary* asserts that the compound *brāhmaṇagahapatika* is a *dvaṃdva* compound expressive of a contrast between Brahmin and householder, the term is also employed as a *tatpuruṣa*, as I translate it here. Consider two of the cases that the dictionary lists as examples. At *M* 1.400, the term refers to a single group of denizens of a village. This seems clearly to refer to the Brahmin householders. At *A* 1.109, the term occurs in a list of *dvaṃdvas*: *brāhmaṇagahapatikesu negamajānapadesu samaṇabrāhmaṇesu migapakkhīsu*, "among the Brahmins and householders, among the country-folk and the town-folk, among the *samaṇas and brāhmaṇas*, among the beasts and birds." Each member of the list is contrastive, showing that *brāhmaṇagahapati* is here used as a *ḍvaṃdva* compound. These two examples demonstrate that the compound is used in both ways; the former interpretation makes the most sense in this context, and also follows the translation of Woodward. For more on the distinction made with this compound see my discussion of *gṛhapati/gahapati* above.

previous and current wife, suggest that the proximate cause of his flawed character is his wife. Sāriputta tells the monk that his previous wife possessed *saddhā*, Skt. *śraddhā*, hospitality,[25] and was brought up in a family possessed of hospitality, but that his current wife is lacking in *saddhā* and from a family lacking in hospitality. Jamison shows similar associations of *śraddhā* with the wife in the Brahmanical materials.[26]

In response, the monk suggests that someone could talk to the Brahmin. Sāriputta then returns to Rājagaha, where Dhanañjāni lives, and engages him in conversation. He begins thus:

> Kaccisi dhanañjāni, appamatto'ti?
> 'Kuto bho sāriputta, amhākaṃ appamādo yesaṃ no mātāpitaro posetabbā, puttadārā posetabbā, dāsakammakaraporisaṃ posetabbaṃ, mittāmaccānaṃ mittāmaccakaraṇīyaṃ kātabbaṃ ñātisālohitānaṃ ñātisālohitakaraṇīyaṃ kātabbaṃ, atithīnaṃ atithikaraṇīyaṃ kātabbaṃ, pubbapetānaṃ pubbapeta-karaṇīyaṃ kātabbaṃ, devatānaṃ devatākaraṇīyaṃ kātabbaṃ, rañño rājakaraṇīyaṃ kātabbaṃ, ayampi kāyo pīnetabbo brūhetabbo'ti. *M* ii.186
>
> "I hope that you are being diligent, Dhanañjāni?"
> "How could I be diligent, good Sāriputta, when I must support my parents, support my wife and children, obligations to fulfill for friends and acquaintances, fulfill obligations to kith and kin, fulfill obligations to guests, fulfill obligations for the ancestors, fulfill obligations to the *devatās*, fulfill obligations to the king—and this body too must be satisfied and looked after."

Of course Dhanañjāni does not bring up his nefarious occupation as an excuse for his failure to remain diligent, and Sāriputta does not visit his concerns about Dhanañjāni's means of material support yet. However, the moral of this *sutta* rests on the distinction between Dhanañjāni's occupation and his ritual obligations, listed above in his response

[25] For a better understanding of the term *śraddhā*, particularly the mistaken translation as faith, see Köhler 1973, Jamison 1996 176–184, and Hara 1979. Rao's (1974) study is inadequate in this respect, failing to mention this meaning which is quite common, especially in the large chunk of material he skips between the Upaniṣads and the *Bhagavad Gītā*. Consider *BDhS* 1.10.5–6; 2.12.12; *VDhS* 8.9 for the most clear examples.

[26] "We have also noted that the wife is central to the hospitality system, in some sense embodies these obligations …It is in this light that the otherwise surprising identification found at AB VII.10 śraddhā patnī "the wife is śraddhā" can be interpreted. The wife is indeed 'hospitality' incarnate" (Jamison 1996, 184).

to Sāriputta's inquiry about his diligence. Sāriputta has, from the beginning, made a distinction between his occupation and his ritual obligations as a householder; he accepts Dhanañjāni's list of his obligations without reserve, but contrasts *appamatto*, diligent, with his schemes between the king and Brahmin householders. Dhanañjāni ignores his immoral occupation and blames his inability to remain diligent on his obligations as a householder; a connection Sāriputta will shortly sever. Neither Sāriputta nor Dhanañjāni doubt the centrality of the listed obligations; they are assumed by both men, and, I suggest, for the authors as well. What is at stake for Sāriputta is the occupation that Dhanañjāni engages in to support his obligations and for Dhanañjāni those same obligations justify any occupation, even an immoral one.

Sāriputta convinces Dhanañjāni that the obligations are not an excuse to engage in immoral behavior, more specifically he must accept the responsibility for his actions on his own, not blame the burden of his responsibilities. Dhanañjāni lists the obligations that make it impossible for him to be diligent: supporting his parents, wife, and children; performing services for friends and acquaintances, kith and kin, and guests; performing rites for the ancestors and gods; performing duties for the king; and looking after his own body. This excuse, of course, is insufficient to persuade Sāriputta, who discourses on the futility of blaming one's failure to adhere to the *dhamma* on any of these persons.

> Taṃ kiṃ maññasi dhanañjāni, idhekacco mātāpitunnaṃ hetu adhammacārī visamacārī assa, tamenaṃ adhammacariyā visamacariyāhetu nirayaṃ nirayapālā upakaḍḍheyyuṃ. Labheyya nu kho so 'ahaṃ kho mātāpitunnaṃ hetu adhammacārī visamacārī ahosiṃ, mā maṃ nirayaṃ nirayapālā'ti. Mātāpitaro vā panassa labheyyuṃ 'eso kho amhākaṃ hetu adhammacārī visamacārī ahosi, mā naṃ nirayaṃ nirayapālā'ti. *M* ii.186
>
> What do you think of this, Dhanañjāni? Suppose there were someone who did not follow the *dhamma*, acting in the wrong way, because of his mother and father; because of his not following the *dhamma*, acting in a wrong way, the guardians of hell would drag him off to hell. Now then, Does he gain anything saying, "I do not follow the *dhamma*, acting in the wrong way, because of my mother and father; may the guardians of hell not (drag) me off to hell"? And do his mother

> and father gain anything saying, "He does not follow the *dhamma*, acting in the wrong way, because of us, may the guardians of hell not (drag) him off to hell"?

Dhanañjāni responds in the only way he can, denying his own excuse in the process.

> No hidaṃ bho sāriputta, atha kho naṃ vikkandantaṃ yeva niraye nirayapālā pakkhipeyyuṃ. *M* ii.186
>
> No, Sāriputta sir, surely the guardians of hell would throw him, screaming, down to hell.

Sāriputta then continues to pursue the same line of questioning with each of Dhanañjāni's excuses, recognizing each of his obligations in turn and denying their use as an excuse which the guardians of hell will accept. In the end Sāriputta makes his point explicitly, finally ending Dhanañjāni's evasion of his immoral occupation.

> Atthi kho dhanañjāni, aññe sahetukā dhammikā kammantā, ye hi sakkā mittāmaccānañceva mittāmaccakaraṇīyaṃ kātuṃ, na ca pāpaṃ kammaṃ kattuṃ, puññañca paṭipadaṃ paṭipajjituṃ. Taṃ kiṃ maññasi dhanañjāni, yo vā ñātisālohitānaṃ hetu adhammacārī visamacārī assa, yo vā ñātisālohitānaṃ hetu dhammacārī samacārī assa. Katamaṃ seyyo'ti.? *M* ii.190
>
> "There are, Dhanañjāni, other moral and dhammic occupations (*kammatā*) by which one is able to support one's parents and not commit evil deeds (*kamma*) but rather proceed on a course that is good. What do you think about this Dhanañjāni? Which his better: he who is a doer of wrong, as the crooked, because of his wife and children; or he who is a doer of good, as the straight, because of his wife and children?"

Sāriputta's reprimand, refers the reader back to his original conversation with the monk about Dhanañjāni's situation. Contrasting *kammatā*, occupation, against *kamma*, works or deeds; he argues that there are other occupations (*kammatā*), righteous occupations, by which Dhanañjāni can fulfill his obligations, i.e., ritual (*kamma*). He does not argue against or seek to reshape these obligations, including ritual obligations, in Buddhist terms, but rather the manner in which they are supported.[27]

[27] There follows in the same *sutta* an encounter later in Dhanañjāni's life where Sāriputta comes back when the Brahmin is ill and teaches him how to achieve *brahmānaṃ sahavyatāya*, companionship with Brahmā, a metaphor for achieving heaven. The connection between these two accounts is not apparent.

The significance of this account for the current discussion lies in Dhanañjāni's description of his life and Sāriputta's response to the Brahmin's excuse that these obligations are the cause of his failure to remain diligent in the *dhamma*. Both Dhanañjāni's list of his obligations and Sāriputta's subsequent acknowledgement of each accord in one respect: the householder stand at the nexus of a vast social network; in fact, he has obligations to a considerable number of social actors, human and supernatural. Dhanañjāni relies on the sheer number of obligations to prove to Sāriputta that his failure to remain diligent is justified. For his part, Sāriputta argues just the opposite: the normal householder life is not opposed to keeping the *dhamma*; these obligations are independent of the occupation one chooses. One can fulfill all these normal aspect of householder life and still live according to the *dhamma*. I will return to this shortly.

More significantly, Dhanañjāni is not a straw man set up by the Buddhist author; this general conception of the householder is also found in the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*.

> devatātithibhṛtyānāṃ pitṝṇām ātmanaś ca yaḥ |
> na nirvapati pañcānām ucchvasan na sa jīvati || *MDhŚ* 3.72
>
> Gods, guests, dependents, ancestors and oneself—when someone does not make offerings to these five, he has breath but no life at all. (Olivelle)

Dhanañjāni expresses nine categories of actors who require his attention: parents, wife and children, friends and acquaintances, kith and kin, guests, ancestors, *devatās*, king, and himself, whereas Manu relates only five. The correspondence between these two lists is remarkable, especially considering the following. Manu and Dhanañjāni both use the term *devatā*, though this passage appears in Manu's section on the *mahāyajña*, in which the term for the deities offered oblations is usually *deva*. Both employ the term *atithi*, a technical term for guest. Manu uses the term *pitṛ* for the ancestors; Dhanañjāni uses the term *pubbapeta*; both refer to the deceased. Manu's term *bhṛtya*, dependent, is a broad

term that certainly has the potential to cover the first four groups on Dhanañjāni's list. Finally both authors include oneself as one of the obligations of a householder.

The only person on Dhanañjāni's list that finds no place on Manu's is the king; this is certainly a function of the social milieu of the Buddhist authors. Olivelle has argued that the authors of the Dharmasūtras and Manu were advocating a ritual life that flourished in the village as opposed to the city (1993, 58–62). The Buddhist community probably flourished in an urban setting and kings figure prominently in the narratives in the Pāli Canon. I suggest that the inclusion of the king on Dhanañjāni's list, and its exclusion from Manu's list, is explained by these circumstances.[28]

Both Brahmin and Buddhist authors, then, share a conception of what the householder's life entails; they seem to agree on the centrality of the householder to the social network—encompassing human and supernatural actors—he occupies. That Sāriputta does not argue for Dhanañjāni to abandon the obligations that define his life and Manu's exhortation that one who fails to give offerings does not truly live both emphasize the obligatory nature of these duties and their centrality to a shared conception of the householder.

These two passages appear to capture a purely descriptive account of the householder's life. In the *Dhanañjānisutta* the Buddhist author's purpose is to speak to the compatibility of the householder life and the Buddhist *dhamma*; he seems to have no motive to offer an intellectualized, i.e., theological, take on householder duties. It appears to be a candid take on householder life. The passage from the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* appears in Manu's discussion of the *pañcamahāyajña*, but fails to accord well with the

[28] It must be admitted here that Manu includes a section on the king. However, I believe Manu is still appealing to the village Brahmin, who, though more clearly in the Dharmasūtras than the Dharmaśāstras, conceives of himself as outside the temporal authority of the king.

other expressions of that theology in the same section. The obligations that appear in this passage and in the five great sacrifices do not reflect a specifically Brahmanical view of ritual obligations. For example, it lacks the *brahmayajña*, sacrifice to the Veda, which is intimately connected to the Brahmanical self-identity. Whereas the five great sacrifices clearly exhibit a prescriptive formulation that is embedded in Brahmanical presuppositions about the centrality of the Vedas, the passage discussed here describes householder's obligations without an explicitly Brahmanical stamp. This conception of the householder must have operated in much the same way that the stock of "floating proverbial wisdom" that Bühler and Olivelle recognize in the composition of *dharma* literature (Olivelle 2005, 6 and 23). The majority of the passages in the Brahmanical and Buddhist texts that reflect on householder obligations, however, find discursive application.

The authors of other texts shape the shared assumptions evident in the two passages discussed above, which appear more descriptive than prescriptive. These theologies represent the householder and his responsibilities in more discursive argumentation. In other words, they aim to justify and define the householder's life, particularly the ritual aspect of his life. The majority of this chapter is dedicated to explicating the theological construction of the householder's ritual obligations. First are reviewed those that revolve around the metaphor of sacrifice, beginning with the *pañcamahāyajña*.

PAÑCAMAHĀYAJÑA: THE FIVE GREAT SACRIFICES

This section describes the historical development of the doctrine of *pañcamahāyajña*, demonstrating that that the doctrine of the five great sacrifices had two goals: to legitimize and naturalize the ritual obligations of the householder and to offer an abbreviated version of the full Vedic ritual repertoire that could be performed every day.

Five Great Sacrifices in the Brāhmaṇas

One of the earliest expressions of this theology appears in the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*.[29]

> páñca vā́ eté mahāyajñā́ḥ satatí pratāyante satatí saṃtiṣṭhante devayajñáḥ pitṛyajñó bhūtayajñó manuṣyayajñó brahmayajñá íti, íti | yád agnáu juhóty apí samídhaṃ tád evá yajñáḥ saṃtiṣṭhate íti | yát pitŕ̥bhyaḥ svadhā́ karóty apy apás tát pitṛyajñáḥ saṃtiṣṭhate íti | yád bhūtébhyo balíṃ harati tád bhūtayajñáḥ saṃtiṣṭhate íti | yád brāhmaṇébhyo ‘nnaṃ dádāti tán manuṣyayajñáḥ saṃtiṣṭhate íti | yás svādhyāyám adhīyītáikám apy ṛcáṃ yájuḥ sā́ma vā tád brahmayajñáḥ saṃtiṣṭhate íti | *TĀ* 2.10.1
>
> The great sacrifices are five; they are spread out daily; they are accomplished daily: the sacrifice to the gods, the sacrifice to the Pitṛs, the sacrifice to beings, the sacrifice to men, and the sacrifice to the Veda. When one merely offers a piece of wood into the fire, he accomplishes a sacrifice (to the gods). When one performs *svadhā* for the Pitṛs, even water, he accomplishes a sacrifice to the Pitṛs. When he offers an oblation to the *bhūtas*, he accomplishes the sacrifice to the beings. When he gives food to Brahmins, he accomplishes a sacrifice to men. When he learns the recitation of the Veda, even one *ṛc*, *yajus*, or *sāman*, he accomplishes a sacrifice to the Veda.

The five sacrifices are: *devayajña*, the sacrifice to the gods; *pitṛyajña*, the sacrifice to the Pitṛs; *bhūtayajña*, the sacrifice to beings; *manuṣyayajña*, the sacrifice to men; and

[29] It also appears, in a slightly different formulation, in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*:

> páñcaivá mahāyajñā́ḥ tā́ny evá mahāsatrā́ṇi bhūtayajñó manuṣyayajñáḥ pitṛyajñó devayajñó brahmayajñá íti | 1 áharahar bhūtébhyo balíṃ haret | táthaitám bhūtayajñáṃ sámāpnoty áharahar dadyā́d odapātrā́t táthaitám manuṣyayajñáṃ sámāpnoty áharahaḥ svadhā́ kuryā́d odapātrā́t táthaitám pitṛyajñáṃ sámāpnoty áharahaḥ svā́hā kuryā́d ā́ kāṣṭhā́t táthaitáṃ devayajñáṃ sámāpnoti | 2 átha brahmayajñáḥ | svādhyāyó vái brahmayajñás … *ŚB* 11.5.6.1–3
>
> 1 There are five great sacrifices; those indeed are great sacrificial sessions: the sacrifice to bhūtas, the sacrifice to men, the sacrifice to the Pitṛs, the sacrifice to the gods, and the sacrifice to the Veda. 2 Every day he should offer an oblation to the bhūtas; in that way he accomplishes this sacrifice to the bhūtas. Every day he should give up to water pot; in that way he accomplishes the sacrifice to men. Every day he should perform the *svadhā*, at least a water pot; in that way he accomplishes the sacrifice to the Pitṛs. Every day he should perform the svāhā, at least a piece of wood; in that way he accomplishes the sacrifice to the gods. 3 Now, the sacrifice to *Brahman*; Vedic recitation is the sacrifice to the Veda.

With respect to the sacrifice to men, the author of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* and the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* differ in their expression—the former reads *áharahar dadyā́d odapātrā́t*, where the latter reads *brāhmaṇébhyo ‘nnaṃ dádāti*—but they refer to the same duty: one should feed Brahmins. The proper recipient of guest hospitality is a Brahmin, thus the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* is more specific, but both authors refer to the same practice.

brahmayajña, the sacrifice to the Veda. The sacrifice to the gods is accomplished by pronouncing the word *svāhā*—a ritual formula employed in the larger Vedic ritual to praise the gods—and offering at least a piece of wood. This represents a token ritual that satisfies the daily obligation to sacrifice to the gods. One accomplishes the sacrifice to the Pitṛs by pronouncing the word *svadhā*[30]— a ritual formula used in the ancestral rites to praise the Pitṛs—and offering at least a little water. These simple daily offerings replace the more extended monthly ancestral rites, as do all of the *mahāyajñas*. The sacrifice to beings, a general category meant to encompass those left out of the other categories, is accomplished by offering an offering, *bali*.

Five Great Sacrifices in the Śrautasūtras

The doctrine of the five sacrifices endures the ages and appears in most of the subsequent literature. I was unable to find any direct reference in the Śrautasūtras[31] to the doctrine of the great sacrifices, though the term *mahāyajña* does appear here and in the Brāhmaṇas as a term of praise for specific sacrifices.[32]

As technical ritual manuals, their audience did not need convincing of the propriety of a ritual life, one aim of this doctrine. Their topic focused on the minutiae of larger ritual apparatus, not the abbreviated set that the *mahāyajña* represents; thus the near absence of this doctrine in the Śrautasūtras is not completely surprising.

30 I discuss this term in great detail in Chapter 2.

31 In the context of the Hotṛ's recitation in the kindling of the fire wood, *Śāṅkhāyana Śrautasūtra* mentions four of the five entities sacrificed to in the five great sacrifices, i.e., gods, men, Pitṛs, and beings.

32 *ŚB* 2.4.4.14; 11.7.2.2; *AB* 2.1.7; *ŚŚS* 14.5.4; 14.8.11; 15.11.9. Most appear to be simple praise, but *ŚŚS* 14.8.11 at least makes a distinction between *kāmayajña* and *mahāyajña*, which may indicate this term was used in a different categorization of rituals. This serves as a reminder of the fluidity of terminology in general.

Five Great Sacrifices in the Gṛhyasūtras

The authors of the Gṛhyasūtras, on the other hand, felt the need to employ this heuristic category. Let us review the five great sacrifices as they appear in the Gṛhyasūtras.

Āśvalāyana describes the great sacrifices in this way:

> athātaḥ pañcayajñāḥ | 1
> devayajño bhūtayajñaḥ pitṛyajño brahmayajño manuṣyayajña iti | 2
> tad yad agnau juhoti sa devayajño yad baliṃ karoti sa bhūtayajño yat pitṛbhyo dadāti sa pitṛyajño yat svādhyāyam adhīyate sa brahmayajño yan manuṣyebhyo dadāti sa manuṣyayajña iti | 3
> tān etān yajñān aharahaḥ kurvīta | *ĀśGS* 3.1.1–4
>
> And now the Five Sacrifices. 1
> The sacrifice to the gods, the sacrifice to beings, the sacrifice to the Pitṛs, the sacrifice to the Veda, and the sacrifice to men. 2
> That which he offers into the fire, that is the sacrifice to the gods. The *bali* he performs, that is the sacrifice to beings. That which he gives to the Pitṛs, that is the sacrifice to the Pitṛs. The recitation of the Veda which is repeated, that is the sacrifice to the Vedas. That which he gives to men, that is the sacrifice to men. 3
> He should do those sacrifices daily. 4

While the author preserves the *yajña* label in listing the five great sacrifices, he uses almost the same terminology that the Brāhmaṇa and Āraṇyaka authors did. Āśvalāyana employs the term *svādhyāya* as the older tradition does; he uses the same verbal formulations—e.g., *agnau juhoti*—for the other sacrifices. However, instead of using the ritual word *svadhā*, synecdoche for the whole ancestor worship ritual, to refer to the ancestral rites, this *sūtrakāra* uses the same verbal formulations he uses in his section on those rites. The verb √*dā*, to give is commonly used in the instructions for the *śrāddha*. In fact, in the *Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhyasūtra*, the author introduces all the different types of *śrāddha* with labels (*ŚGS* 4.2–4), but the *pārvaṇa śrāddha*, the paradigmatic ritual of this type, he introduces with the phrase *māsi māsi pitṛbhyo dadyād*, "He should give to the Pitṛs every month" (*ŚGS* 4.1.1). The verb √*dā* with the Pitṛs implies the ritual offering to

the ancestors, in this literature and elsewhere.[33] A similar reference follows from the use of the same verb, √*dā*, with men. The implication is "to give in ritual." Thus, the language employed in different genres to refer to the *pañcamahāyajña* is quite conservative.

The *Pāraskara Gṛhyasūtra* preserves a more complicated inheritance. Unlike Āśvalāyana's rather straightforward description, Pāraskara's two references to the *mahāyajña* are cryptic, though each in its own way. The first is a simple reference to the five great sacrifices. In the section on the establishment of the sacred domestic fire, Pāraskara quotes the view of other scholars and includes their reasoning.

> araṇipradānam eke | 5
> pañcamahāyajñā iti śruteḥ | *PGS* 1.2.5–6
>
> Some say there is the presentation of the fire-sticks, 5
> Because in the *śruti* it says, "There are five great sacrifices." 6

The author records the opinion that the *gṛhya* rites are sacrifices which require the *araṇi*, the wood used to kindle the fire in the *śrauta* rites. The use of the term *mahāyajña* does not clarify for us any theological implications it may have carried in this context, but in another context, the doctrine of the five great sacrifices is more clear. However, Pāraskara expands upon the categories found in the Brāhmaṇas, extending the scope of the original idea.

> athātaḥ pañcamahāyajñāḥ | 1
> vaiśvadevād annāt paryukṣya svāhākārair juhuyād brahmaṇe prajāpataye gṛhyābhyaḥ kaśyapāyānumataya iti | 2
> bhūtagṛhyebhyo maṇike trīn parjanyāyādbhyaḥ pṛthivyai | 3
> dhātre vidhātra ca dvāryayoḥ | 4
> pratidiśaṃ vāyave diśāṃ ca | 5
> madhye trīn brahmaṇe 'ntarikṣāya sūryāya | 6
> viśvebhyo devebhyo viśvebhyaś ca bhūtebhyas teṣāṃ uttarataḥ | 7
> uṣase bhūtānāṃ ca pataye param | 8

[33] See Chapter 2 on the Buddhist material, particularly the *Petavatthu*.

pitṛbhyaḥ svadhā nama iti dakṣiṇataḥ | 9
pātraṃ nirṇijyottarāparasyāṃ diśi ninayed yakṣmaitat iti | 10
uddhṛtyāgraṃ brāhmaṇāyāvanejya dadyād dhanta ta iti | 11
yathārhaṃ bhikṣukān atithīṃṣ ca saṃbhajeran | 12
bālajyeṣṭhā gṛhyā yathārham aśnīyuḥ | 13
paścād gṛhapatiḥ patnī ca | 14
pūrvo vā gṛhapatiḥ | tasmād u svāṣṭaṃ gṛhapatiḥ pūrvo 'tithibhyo 'śnīyād iti śruteḥ | 15
aharahar svāhā kuryād annābhāve kena cid ākāṣṭhād devebhyaḥ pitṛbhyo manuṣyebhyaś codapātrāt | *PGS* 2.9.1–16

Now the five great sacrifices. 1
Having sprinkled from the Vaiśvadeva food, he should offer with the pronouncement of *svāhā*, to *brahman*, to Prajāpati, to the domestic goddesses, to Kaśyapa, and the Anumati. 2
To the domestic *bhūtas* he should (offer) three times into the water pot: to Parjanya, to the waters, and to the earth. 3
To the Creator and the Preserver at the two door-posts. 4
In the four directions (he should offer) to Vāyu and (the deities of the) directions.[34] 5
In the middle (he should offer) to *brahman*, to the intermediate space, to Sūrya. 6
North of these (he should offer) to all the gods and all the *bhūtas*. 7
Further (he should offer) to Uṣas and to the Lord of *bhūtas*. 8
To the south (he should offer) with "Reverence to the Pitṛs, Svadhā!" 9
Having washed the vessel, he should pour it out to the north-west with, "Consumption, This is yours." 10
Having taken up the first, having made a Brahmin wash himself, he should give it with "Well, for you." 11
He should distribute to *bhikṣukas* and guests as far as they are worthy. 12
Those of his house, young and old, should eat, as far as they are worthy. 13
Afterwards, the householder and his wife. 14
Of the householder first, because of the statement in *śruti*, "Therefore, the householder should eat the *svāṣṭa* before the guests." 15
Daily he should perform the *svāhā*; in the absence of food with something else: at least a piece of firewood for the gods and at least a water pot to the Pitṛs and men. 16

Instead of the simple descriptions of the five great sacrifices that we have seen thus far, Pāraskara expands the brief references and gives us many details of his conception of each of the five categories. The first and last *sūtra* correspond to the usual expression of

[34] Cf. *Pv* 1.4.11.

the great sacrifices; the rest of the *sūtras* fill in the blanks, so to speak. *Sūtras* 2 through 8 refer to offering to gods and beings, though the distinction seems to be somewhat ambiguous. *Sūtra* 9 clearly refers to offerings to the Pitṛs. *Sūtra* 10 seems to be an oblation to stave off disease, while 11 through 15 refer to varying levels of hospitality.

Conspicuous in its absence is the *brahmayajña*; two factors contribute to this omission. First is the nature of that 'sacrifice;' it is a sacrifice only in name. The other four, I suggest, are more similar to the tradition of offering *balis*, which leads to the second factor. I believe that Pāraskara noticed the similarity of the *mahāyajña*, which is still only a theological construction used by the Brahmins to legitimate ritual life, to the offerings of *balis* found throughout the Gṛhyasūtras and combined the two.[35] He brings together similar sets of offerings to different classes of beings; the label *mahāyajña* simply offers a more convenient container. This may also help explain the absence of the sacrifice to the Veda. Additionally, several of the Brahmanical authors seem to record different classifications of the rituals, as will be discussed later; this appears to simply be one more effort in that direction.

The Five Great Sacrifices in the Dharmasūtras

The theology of the great sacrifices finds a place in the Dharmasūtras as well; each author addresses this doctrine, though each to a different extent. Āpastamba fits his description of the *mahāyajñas* in the middle of his section on the duties of a student who has returned home, immediately after the rules of recitation of the Veda.

> atha brāhmaṇoktā vidhayaḥ | 13
> teṣāṃ mahāyajñā mahāsattrāṇīti saṃstutiḥ | 14

[35] Consider the *bali* offerings in the wedding seen at *KhGS* 1.5.21f, the offerings also a part of the wedding at *PGS* 1.12, the *bali* offerings at *GGS* 1.4, the offerings of the evening and morning at *ĀśGS* 1.2.3, and at the offering of an ox to Rudra at *ĀśGS* 4.8.22f.

This may also illuminate the interrelatedness of the Brahmanical and Buddhist conceptions of ritual expressed in these ideologies, consider, for example the *pañca bali*, discussed below.

ahar ahar bhūtabalir manuṣyebhyo yathāśakti dānam | 12.15
devebhyaḥ svāhākāra ā kāṣṭhāt pitṛbhyaḥ svadhākāra odapātrāt svādhyāya iti | *ĀpDhS* 1.12.13–13.1

13 Now, rites mentioned in the Brāhmaṇas.
14 Among these are the *mahāyajña*, praised as great sacrificial sessions.
15 Everyday (he should perform): oblations to beings; giving to men, according to his ability; 1 performing *svāhā* for the gods, at least a piece of wood; performing *svadhā* for the Pitṛs, at least a water pot; and the recitation of the Veda.

The referent of each of the great sacrifices is the same; even the language uses echoes the terms used in the Brāhmaṇas.[36] Gautama evidently feels that the doctrine is too well known to spend much time on it.

devapitṛmanuṣyabhūtarṣipūjakaḥ | 3
nityasvādhyāyaḥ | 4
pitṛbhyaś codakadānaṃ | 5
yathotsāham anyat | *GDhS* 5.3–6

3 He should worship the gods, Pitṛs, men, *bhūtas*, and Ṛṣis:
4 He should daily perform the recitation of the Veda
5 And give water to the Pitṛs,
6 And (should perform) the others, according to his ability.

Gautama only briefly mentions the five *pañcamahāyajña*, using only one *suṭra*, elaborating only briefly on the specifics of two. Significantly, Gautama recognizes degrees of imperative with respect to the great sacrifices.[37]

[36] For a comparison of the terms used to define the *mahāyajña* in different texts, a comparison which reveals a very conservative tradition, see Table 4.

[37] While his list of the five matches the other authors, he chooses to mention two of those five in a marked way. *Sūtra* 3 lists the five sacrifices; *sūtras* 4, 5, and 6 give us a clue into the reality of their performance. Of the five, the recitation of the Veda—which corresponds to the *ṛṣipūja* mentioned in *sūtra* 3—and the offering of water to one's ancestors—which corresponds to the *pitṛpūja* mentioned in *sūtra* 3—are to be performed daily, and the others are to be performed when one is able. The author recognizes that the recitation of the Veda and a simple offering of water are not onerous tasks; neither requires substantial investment of time or money. The other three, which require greater resources, are to be performed when one is able. This gives us a valuable insight into the on the ground lived reality of the *pañcamahāyajña*.

Additionally, there is some degree of ambiguity at to the scope of the term *nitya* in *sūtra 2*; I have followed the commentators in taking it to govern both *sūtras* 2 and 3. It is also possible, though less likely in my view that the translation of those two *sūtras* should read: He should perform the daily recitation of the Veda and give water to the Pitṛs; and perform the others, according to his ability.

Whereas Gautama is brief, Baudhāyana is verbose; in a rhythmic style he repeats the formulaic definitions of each of the great sacrifices.

> atheme pañca mahāyajñāḥ | tāny eva mahāsattrāṇi | devayajñaḥ pitṛyajño bhūtayajño manuṣyayajño brahmayajña iti || 1
> aharahaḥ svāhā kuryād ā kāṣṭhāt | tathaitaṃ devayajñaṃ samāpnoti || 2
> aharahaḥ svadhā kuryād odapātrāt | tathaitaṃ pitṛyajñaṃ samāpnoti || 3
> aharahar namas kuryād ā puṣpebhyaḥ | tathaitaṃ bhūtayajñaṃ samāpnoti || 4
> aharahar brāhmaṇebhyo 'nnaṃ dadyād ā mūlaphalaśākebhyaḥ | tathaitaṃ manuṣyayajñaṃ samāpnoti || 5
> aharahaḥ svādhyāyaṃ kuryād ā praṇavāt | tathaitaṃ brahmayajñaḥ samāpnoti || 6
> svādhyāyo vai brahmayajñaḥ | … *BDhS* 2.11.1–7
>
> 1 Now, these are the five great sacrifices, which are the great sacrificial sessions: the sacrifice to the gods, the sacrifice to the Pitṛs, the sacrifice to beings, the sacrifice to men, and the sacrifice to the Veda.
> 2 Everyday he should perform the *svāhā*, at least a piece of wood, in that way he accomplishes the sacrifice to the gods.
> 3 Everyday he should perform the *svadhā*, at least a pot of water, in that way he accomplishes the sacrifice to the Pitṛs.
> 4 Everyday he should perform reverence, at least flowers, in that way he accomplishes the sacrifice to beings.
> 5 Everyday he should give food to a Brahmin, at least roots, fruit, or vegetables, in that way he accomplishes the sacrifice to men.
> 6 Everyday he should perform the recitation of the Veda, at least the syllable Oṃ, in that way he accomplishes the sacrifice to the Veda.
> 7 The sacrifice to the Veda is Vedic recitation.

In his lengthy description he gives us more detail. The sacrifice to beings, he tells us, includes reverence, which can be as minimal as offering flowers. For the sacrifice to men he gives us examples of appropriate offerings of food. All in all, though, the descriptions are not new. Finally, Vasiṣṭha (*VDhS* 27.7) mentions the five great sacrifices, but neither lists them nor defines them; clearly he assumes this is common knowledge for his audience.

Thus we see that the *mahāyajña* theology has undergone little innovation in the Gṛhyasūtras and the Dharmasūtras. However, a different notion for classifying the rituals codified in the Gṛhyasūtras arises and intersects with the doctrine of the *mahāyajñas*, the

sacrifice to the Pitṛs in particular, the '*huta* scheme'. The next section addresses the second of the conceptualization of the householder's ritual obligations that employs the metaphor of sacrifice.

THE '*HUTA* SCHEME'

As with the *mahāyajña*, the authors of the Gṛhyasūtras record this alternate system of categorizing rituals employing sacrificial terminology. Āśvalāyana begins his Gṛhyasūtra by listing the three kinds of *pākayajña*, sacrifice of cooked foods.

> uktāni vaitānikāni gṛhyāni vakṣyāmaḥ | 1
> trayaḥ pākayajñāḥ | 2
>
> hutā agnau hūyamānā anagnau prahutā brāhmaṇa-bhojane brahmaṇi hutāḥ | 3
> athāpy ṛca udāharanti | yaḥ samidhā ya āhutī yo vedeneti | 4
> samidham evāpi śraddadhāna ādadhan manyeta yaja idam iti namas tasmai ya āhutyā yo vedeneti vidyayaivāpy asti prītis … *ĀśGS* 1.1.1–5
>
> 1 The rites related to the three sacred fires have been declared; we will declare the domestic (rites).
> 2 The *pākayajñas* are three:
> 3 *huta*, which are offered into the fire; *prahuta*, not offered in the fire; and *brahmaṇi huta* which is feeding Brahmins.
> 4 They also quote this *ṛc*, "One who with firewood, with an oblation, with knowledge…"
> 5 Placing even a piece of firewood, with *śraddhā*, he should think "I sacrifice this. Reverence to him." "Who with an oblation, with knowledge" Even by just knowledge there is satisfaction. …

Āśvalāyana divides the types of *pākayajñas* into three types: *huta*, those offering into the fire; *ahuta*, those not offered into a fire; and *brahmaṇi huta*, those offered onto Brahmins. In his exposition on the different types of *pākayajña*, Āśvalāyana quotes a *mantra* and alludes to correlations between the *pākayajña* and the *mahāyajña*. The phrase *samidham eva*, "even a piece of firewood," surely had resonances with the phrase *samídhaṃ tád eva*, "merely a piece of wood," from *TĀ* 2.10.1, seen above, which occurs in the

description of the five great sacrifices. Further correspondences between the '*huta* scheme' and the *mahāyajñas* is more evident in other works, as I will now show.

While Āśvalāyana enumerates three types, Śāṅkhāyana lists four.

> catvāraḥ pākayajñā huto 'hutaḥ prahutaḥ prāśita iti | *ŚGS* 1.5.1
> The pākayajña are four: huta, ahuta, prahuta, and prāśita.
>
> huto agnihotrahomenāhuto balikarmaṇā |
> prahutaḥ pitṛkarmaṇā prāśito brāhmaṇe hutaḥ | *ŚGS* 1.10.7
> A *huta* is (done) by making an oblation in the Agnihotra, an *ahuta* by rites of the *bali*, the *prahuta* by rites to the Pitṛs, *prāśita* is an offering into Brahmins.

Both authors agree on the basic definitions of the types of *pākayajñas*, but whereas Āśvalāyana offers verses from the *Ṛg Veda* as support for the classification, Śāṅkhāyana simply defines them. Viewed together, Śāṅkhāyana and Āśvalāyana's accounts illustrate increasing correspondences between the *pākayajñas* and the *mahāyajñas* quite well.

The three categories in common then are: *huta*, what is offering into the fire; *ahuta*, what is not offered into a fire, and *prāśita*, what is offered into Brahmins. Śāṅkhāyana adds a fourth category: *prahuta*, what is offered to the Pitṛs, following the original scheme based on the ritual term, *huta*. This suggests that the conception of these categories was the notion of an offering: an offering into the fire, an offering not in a fire, i.e., on the ground, an offering into a Brahmin, and an offering to the ancestors

THE '*HUTA* SCHEME' AND THE *MAHĀYAJÑA* THEOLOGY

Like the *mahāyajña* theology, this new classification plays on the currency of sacrifice, specifically the efficacy of the offerings made into the fire. It derives the names of offering, more broadly, from the name for offerings of ghee into the sacrificial fire. There also exists a correspondence in the content of these two schemes; consider Table 2.

	devayajña	pitṛyajña	bhūtayajña	manuṣyayajña	brahmayajña
ĀśGS	agnau juhoti	pitṛbhyo dadāti	balim karoti	manuṣyebhyo dadāti	svādhyāyam adhīte
ĀśGS	agnau hūyamānā		anagnau	brāhmaṇa-bhojane	
ŚGS	agnihotrahomena	pitṛkarmaṇā	balikarmaṇā	brāhmaṇe hutaḥ	
	huta	Prahuta	ahuta	brahmaṇi huta / prāśita	

Table 2: Correspondence between the *mahāyajñas* and the '*huta* scheme'.

The correspondence is most clear in Śāṅkhāyana's formulation; even the language he uses to define the different types of *pākayajña* correspond to the *mahāyajñas* as Āśvalyāyana, and earlier authors, expresses them. One curiosity of this correspondence is that Āśvalāyana does not make the association explicit with his language as Śāṅkhāyana does, especially in light of Śāṅkhāyana's failure to mention the *mahāyajñas*. To sum up: the '*huta* scheme' is an alternative set of categories for describing the obligations of the householder, which, like the *mahāyajña* theology, employs sacrificial language. Further, the overlap of the ritual obligations described by these two prescriptive schemes, seems to have led to their homologization.

HOMOLOGIZING THE *MAHĀYAJÑA* THEOLOGY AND THE '*HUTA* SCHEME'

The further development of this scheme in the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* brings the *mahāyajña* theology and the '*huta* scheme' into a single conversation. Whereas the three Gṛhyasūtra authors discussed describe both the *mahāyajña* and the '*huta* scheme', though in differing ways, none explicitly connect the two concepts. Manu joins the two classifications, modifying them in the process.

In discussing the householders primary ritual responsibilities Manu addresses the *mahāyajña* in a new context. He incorporates a new justification for the performance of the five great sacrifices.

> vaivāhike 'gnau kurvīta gṛhyaṃ karma yathāvidhi |
> pañcayajñavidhānaṃ ca paktiṃ cānvāhikīṃ gṛhī || 67
> pañca sūnā gṛhasthasya cullī peṣaṇy upaskaraḥ |

> kaṇḍanī codakumbhaś ca badhyate yās tu vāhayan || 68
> tāsāṃ krameṇa sarvāsāṃ niṣkṛtyarthaṃ maharṣibhiḥ |
> pañca kḷptā mahāyajñāh pratyahaṃ gṛhamedhinām || 69
> adhyāpanaṃ brahmayajñaḥ pitṛyajñas tu tarpaṇam |
> homo daivo balir bhauto nṛyajño 'tithipūjanam || 70
> pañcaitān yo mahāyajñān na hāpayati śaktitaḥ |
> sa gṛhe 'pi vasan nityaṃ sūnādoṣair na lipyate || *MDhŚ* 3.67–71
>
> 67 A householder should perform the domestic rites in his nuptial fire according to the rule, as also the five great sacrifices and the daily cooking. 68 A householder has five slaughter-houses: fireplace, grindstone, broom, mortar and pestle, and water pot. By his use of them, he is fettered. 69 To expiate successively for each of these, the great seers devised the five great sacrifices to be carried out daily by householders. 70 The sacrifice to the Veda is teaching; the sacrifice to the ancestors is the quenching libation; the sacrifice to the gods is the burnt offering; the sacrifice to beings is the Bali offering; and the sacrifice to humans is the honoring of guests. 71 If a man never fails to offer these five great sacrifices to the best of his ability, he remains unsullied by the taint of his slaughter-houses in spite of living permanently at home. (Olivelle)

He reiterates the great sacrifices at the end of this section.

> svādhyāyenārcayeta rṣīn homair devān yathāvidhi |
> pitṝñ chrāddhena nṝn annair bhūtāni balikarmaṇā || *MDhŚ* 3.81
>
> He should duly honor the seers by private vedic recitation, gods with burnt offerings, ancestors with an ancestral offering, humans with food, and beings with a Bali offering. (Olivelle)

The influence of the doctrine of *ahiṃsa*, rising in popularity in this time, can clearly be seen in the innovative take on the place of the great sacrifices in the householder's life seen in the first selection. No longer does the author simply state the obligation to perform the rituals with an optative verb, rather he looks upon the great sacrifices as an expiation for a normal part of every householder's life, the violence inherent in the operating of a household. He recognizes one criticism of the renunciate tradition, i.e., that the householder life involves violence by its very nature, but explains that the daily performance of the five great sacrifices expunge this inherent violence.

The five great sacrifices have changed little from the earlier texts, though Manu uses some new terminology to define some of them. The *brahmayajña* is *adhyāpana*,

teaching; in the Vedic model teaching and learning are both repetition of the sacred texts, thus both terms refer to the act of reciting the Veda;[38] later Manu does use the more traditional term, *svādhāya*. He defines *pitṛyajña* as Vasiṣṭha does, with the word *tarpaṇa*, libations; by this time this term is nearly synonymous with the ancestral offerings (Kane 1974 v2 p1, 668). Despite using the term *nṛyajña* instead of *manuṣyayajña*—a decision probably made for metrical reasons—Manu refers to the age-old custom of hospitality, specifically the ritual reception of a guest, *atithi*. The term *homa*, derived from the root √*hu*, carries the same connotations that the finite verb did in the older literature. Like his predecessors, Manu uses the word *bali*, perhaps the most consistent term in all the formulations of the *mahāyajña*, to refer to the *bhūtayajña*.

Following this tight exposition of the slaughter-house and great sacrifice connection, Manu has a series of *ślokas*, that seem to preserve a variety of traditional expressions of the *mahāyajña*. He includes a different set of five obligations in the following passage, discussed above in the context of the general conception of the householder.

> devatātithibhṛtyānāṃ pitṝṇām ātmanaś ca yaḥ |
> na nirvapati pañcānām ucchvasan na sa jīvati || *MDhŚ* 3.72
>
> Gods, guests, dependents, ancestors and oneself—when someone does not make offerings to these five, he has breath but no life at all. (Olivelle)

That three of the five recipients of these offerings coincide with the recipients of the great sacrifices probably warranted Manu's inclusion of this passage, as mentioned earlier, but it seems clear that this is a different expression of the interdependent nature of the householder's place in the ritual/social world. Notably the absence of the *brahmayajña* may indicate that it is a conception of the householder not constructed by those interested

[38] Both terms, *adhyāpana* and *svādhyāya*, however, come from the same root, so this is merely a new morphology, not a completely new term.

in investing the definition of a householder with specifically Brahmanical connotations.[39] This supports the supposition that this passage represents a perspective on the householder less influenced by sectarian ideological concerns aimed at constructing a particular definition of householder.

Next Manu relates the '*huta* scheme', though he alters it considerably.

> ahutaṃ ca hutaṃ caiva tathā prahutam eva ca |
> brāhmyaṃ hutaṃ prāśitaṃ ca pañcayajñān pracakṣate || 73
> japo 'huto huto homaḥ prahuto bhautiko baliḥ |
> brāhmyaṃ hutaṃ dvijāgryārcā prāśitaṃ pitṛtarpaṇam || 74
> svādhyāye nityayuktaḥ syād daive caiveha karmaṇi |
> daivakarmaṇi yukto hi bibhartīdaṃ carācaram || *MDhŚ* 3.73–75
>
> 73 The five sacrifices are called Ahuta, Huta, Prahuta, Brāhmya-Huta, and Prāśita. The Ahuta—"not offered in the fire"—is soft recitation. 74 The Huta—"offered in the fire"—is a burnt offering. The Prahuta—"offered by scattering"—is the Bali offering to beings. The Brāhmya-Huta—"offered in Brahmins"—is the worship of Brahmins. The Prāśita—"consumed"—is the quenching libation to ancestors. 75 He should apply himself here daily to his vedic recitation and to making offerings to gods; for by applying himself to making offerings to gods, he upholds this world, both the mobile and the immobile. (Olivelle)

He takes up the same ritually oriented terminology found in the Gṛhyasūtras, but he shifts the referents. Table 3 makes clear the changes.

	huta	prahuta	ahuta	brahmaṇi huta / prāśita	
ĀśGS	agnau hūyamānā		anagnau	brāhmaṇa-bhojane	
ŚGS	agnihotrahomena	pitṛkarmaṇā	balikarmaṇā	brāhmaṇe hutaḥ	
MDhŚ	homa	pitṛtarpaṇa	bhautiko bali	dvijāgryārcā	svādhyāye nityayukta
	huta	prāśita	prahuta	brahmyahuta	ahuta

Table 3: '*huta* scheme' in the Gṛhyasūtras and the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*.

[39] See my discussion of the householder at the beginning of this chapter. Also compare with *ŚŚS* 1.4.5, see fn. 31, and *PGS* 2.9.1–16 (p. 41), which include only four of the five sacrifices usually included in the *pañcamahāyajña*, also failing to include the *brahmayajña*.

Manu switched the names of all but the presumed model, *huta*. The term *prāśita*, consumed, now refers to the offerings to the Pitṛs, reinforcing the long standing association of ancestral rites with food. He uses the term *prahuta*, formerly referring to the ancestral offerings to the Pitṛs, to refer to offering to beings. Following the model based on the term *huta*, he coins the term *brahmyahuta* to refer to the hospitality offered to Brahmins. Manu uses the term *ahuta* to mean 'not offered' instead of its older interpretation meaning 'not offered into the fire'; it now refers to the teaching or recitation of Vedic texts. This last shift evidences Manu's most innovative move with respect to the '*huta* scheme' and the *mahāyajñas*.

He combines the two ideological categorizations of ritual into a single system; he does this in two ways: 1. by simply collocating verses which express the two notions and 2. by shifting the referents in the '*huta* scheme' and adding a fifth element. Placing the relevant passages side by side (see Table 4) makes this clear. Manu homologizes these two classificatory systems; two independent ways of talking about the ritual life of a householder were combined and both strengthened the argument that Manu advanced with regard to the ritual obligations of the householder.

This section of the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* begins with a statement of the five great sacrifices and ends with their definition; but it is a slightly different formulation of the great sacrifice. In this last *śloka* the fifth sacrifice is to the Ṛṣis, not *brahman*; the obligation expressed is the same, i.e., to study the Vedas, but the referent has changed. No longer is the sacrifice to the Veda itself, but to its mythic mediators, the Ṛṣis.[40] The only other significant change is more relevant to my thesis; the sacrifice to the Pitṛs is accomplished by performing a *śrāddha*. The explicit correlation of the *pitṛyajña* with the

[40] This may indicate some level of cross pollination with the doctrine of the three debts. The close association of these two theologies needs to be explored more.

śrāddha evidences the shift in ancestor worship mentioned earlier: the older model of *piṇḍapitṛyajña* is no longer dominant, the *śrāddha* is *the* mode of ancestor worship.

	devayajña	pitṛyajña	bhūtayajña	manuṣyayajña	brahmayajña
ŚB	svāhā kuryād ā kāṣṭhāt	svadhā kuryad odapātrāt	bhūtebhyo balim haret	dadyād odapātrāt	svādhyāyo vai
TA	agnau juhoti api samidhaṃ	pitṛbhyaḥ svadhā karoty apy apas	bhūtebhyo baliṃ harati	brāhmaṇebhyo 'nnaṃ dadāti	svādhyāyam adhīyītaikam apy ṛcaṃ yajuḥ sāma vā
ĀśGS	agnau juhoti	pitṛbhyo dadāti	balim karoti	manuṣyebhyo dadāti	svādhyāyam adhīte
ĀpDhS	svāhākāra ā kāṣṭhāt	svadhākāra odapātrāt	bhūtabalair	yathāśakti dānam	svādhyāya
GDhS	*	pitṛbhyaś codakadānaṃ	*	*	(ṛṣi)svādhyāya
BDhS	svāhā kuryād ā kāṣṭhāt	svadhā kuryād odapātrāt	namas kuryād ā puṣpebhyaḥ	brāhmaṇebhyo 'nnaṃ dadyād ā mūlaphalaśākebhyaḥ	6: svādhyāyaṃ kuryād ā praṇavāt 7: svādhyāyo vai
MDhŚ 70	homa	tarpaṇa	bali	atithipūjana	adhyāpanaṃ
MDhŚ 81	homa	śrāddha	balikarman	Anna	(ṛṣi)svādhyāyena-arcayeta ṛṣīn
VS	homo daivaḥ	pitṛtarpaṇaṃ pitryaḥ	balir bhautaḥ	nṛyajñaś cātithipūjanam	svādhyāyo
ĀśGS	agnau hūyamāna		anagnau (hūyamāna)	brahmaṇa bhojana	
ŚGS	agnihotrahoma	pitṛkarman	balikarman	brāhmane huta	
PGS	[huta]	[prahuta]		[prāśita]	
	huta	prahuta	ahuta	brahmaṇi huta/prāśita	
MDhŚ 73f	homa	pitṛtarpaṇa	bhatiko bali	dvijāgryārcā	svādhyāye nityayukta
	huta	prāśita	prahuta	Brahmyahuta	ahuta

Table 4: Definitions of the *pañcamahāyajña* and the '*huta* scheme' found in the corresponding text.

Manu's consolidation of these two ritual classifications marks a culmination of several threads in the ideological fabric of the Brahmanical efforts to construct the notion of a householder. What were separate arguments or metaphors employed in the discourse around the ritual obligations of the householder coalesce into a single theological statement about the nature and obligations of the householder. The synthesis of these

disparate theological threads was instrumental in the construction of a unitary vision of the authority of *dharmaśāstra*. Rather than different categorizations or descriptions of the ritual obligations of the householder, there was a singular narrative of his ritual life. Olivelle has noted Manu's departure from the earlier tradition of recording the opinions of different teachers in order to create a single, divine, author (Olivelle 2005, 25f). He also identifies structures, e.g., expressions such as *iti cet*, that are indicative of the older model and, viewed in contrast with the frame narrative, are evidence of the purposeful rewriting of an older diverse model into a unitary model (Olivelle 2005 29). I suggest that the synthesis of the *pañcamahāyajña* and the '*huta* scheme' contributes to the consolidation of the Brahmanical theology of ritual obligations. The most dramatic aspect of this synthesis is reordering of the '*huta* scheme' to align more perfectly with the *pañcamahāyajña*, illustrated in Table 4. The diverse expressions are systematized; not only are the *hutas* regularized, but they are simultaneously homologized with the *pañcamahāyajña*, reinforcing the notion of a singular conception of the householder's ritual obligations.

The preceding arguments sums up two Brahmanical constructions of the householder's ritual obligations; a similar Buddhist construction of the householder's ritual obligations, the third conception that revolves around the metaphor of sacrifice, remain to be examined. The *pañca bali* describes one view of the proper use to which wealth can be put; the parallels to the *pañcamahāyajña* doctrine are striking.

THE *PAÑCA BALI*

The *pañca bali*, an expression of five offerings found in the Pāli Canon, appears to be an analogue to the brahmanical *pañcamahāyajña* theology. Law has noted the "parallelism between the Gṛhya list of five *mahāyajñas* and the Pāli list of five *balis*" (1936, 2), but did not fully engage the correspondences between these two lists in their original

contexts. That is the aim of this section, with the hope of better understanding the descriptions available to and discourses constructed by both Brahmins and Buddhists for defining the householder and his obligations.

Buddhist ideologues express the *pañca bali* as a regular list in two places in the Pāli canon. In the first, the *Pañcabhogādiyasutta*, Anāthapiṇḍika the householder inquires of the Buddha the five reasons for getting rich. The fourth reason is to make the five oblations, specifically the *pañca bali*.

> Puna ca paraṃ gahapati ariyasāvako uṭṭhānaviriyādhigatehi bhogehi bāhābalaparicitehi sedāvakkhittehi dhammikehi dhammaladdhehi pañca balīkattā hoti: ñātibaliṃ, atithibaliṃ pubbapetabaliṃ, rājabaliṃ, devatābaliṃ. Ayaṃ catuttho bhogānaṃ ādiyo. *A* iii.45
>
> And again, a householder, a gentlemen disciple, with wealth attained by work and zeal, gathered by the strength of his arms, earned by the sweat of his brow, acquired in accordance with *dhamma* becomes the performer of the five *balis*: the *bali* to relatives, the *bali* to guests, the *bali* to the previously deceased, *bali* to the king, *bali* to the gods. This is the fourth reason for wealth.

The second occurrence, which employs the exact same language, occurs in a list of four deeds done by a man who has righteously acquired wealth.[41] The shared context of the only two formal lists of the *pañca bali* tells us something about the function of this trope in the Pāli canon. Both contexts describe the proper use of wealth that is acquired in a moral manner; they inform the class of wealthy householders about the proper uses of their disposable income.[42]

[41] The passage is identical in almost every respect; only the last sentence, marking it for this particular discourse, differs.

> Puna ca paraṃ gahapati ariyasāvako uṭṭhānaviriyādhigatehi bhogehi bāhābalaparicitehi sedāvakkhittehi dhammikehi dhammaladdhehi pañca balī kattā hoti: ñātibaliṃ atithibaliṃ pubbapetabaliṃ rājabaliṃ devatābaliṃ. Idamassa tatiyaṃ ṭhānagataṃ hoti pattagataṃ āyatanaso paribhuttaṃ. *A* ii.67

[42] This also informs us about the audience of such discourses, namely, wealthy householders. As I suggest in the Introduction, the householder imagined by the authors of both Brahmanical and Buddhist texts are primarily concerned with householders with enough disposable income to be patrons of religious activities, specifically religious activities that require religious experts, e.g. the performance of ritual, gifting, etc.

The *pañca bali* describes the normal duties of the wealthy householder through a ritual lens. The matter-of-fact presentation suggests that this is not a purely Buddhist take on a rival conception of the householder ideal; it is a less discursive reflection of normal householder behavior than the Brahmanical account. By this is meant that the terminology and context may indicate the author's interests, but the fact that this set of five is not presented in an adversarial narrative—as many of the Brahmanical notions that the Buddhist scholars attack or modify are—indicates that it was the author's view of normal householder activity. The fact that the Saṅgha does not appear in the list further suggests that this list is not a purely Buddhist reflection on the householder as a theological construction, but as a lived reality in the world.[43] However, the differences between this list and that shared by both the *Dhanañjānisutta* and the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* mentioned previously suggest that the *pañca bali* is not completely free of Buddhist ideological influence. The degree to which this is a Buddhist construction rather than the elusive non-partisan description of the householder becomes clear in a discussion of the context of this formulation and a comparison of it to the other formulations.

That the main point of this *sutta* has little to do with the way that wealth is spent supports this interpretation. In this *sutta* the emphasis is laid on two points: the manner of acquiring wealth and the lack of attachment to that wealth; the details of the use that wealth is put to seem almost beside the point. The formulaic beginning of the above passage occurs in both the *suttas* in which the *pañca balis* are enumerated: the author wishes to reinforce the individual responsibility of the actor. He earns the wealth by his own actions, as he earns *karma* by his own action. The final section of this *sutta*

[43] A similar point was made in connection to the absence of the *brahmayajña* in *PGS* 1.9.1–16, see p. 41; see also fn. 31.

emphasizes that the individual should not be upset whether his fortunes rise or fall.[44] The lesson here is about abiding in the *dhamma* and resisting attachment to one's wealth. The reward is praise in this world and heaven in the next.

> Etaṃ anussaraṃ macco ariyadhamme ṭhito naro
> Idheva naṃ pasaṃsanti pecca sagge pamodatīti. *A* iii.46
>
> The man who remembers this and abides in the *dhamma*,
> That man is praised here in this world and delights in heaven after death.

The man who can remember the lesson of detachment and live a *dhammic* life despite the obligations of a householder life and being wealthy receives praise and attains heaven. This resonates well with the message of the *Dhanañjānisutta* too, i.e., the householder's ritual obligations are not an obstacle to living life according to the *dhamma*.

While only these two *suttas* formally list the *pañca bali*, this set does occur elsewhere in the Pāli Canon. In the *Sappurisasutta* of the *Anguttara Nikāya*, the Buddha speaks to the assembled monks about the *sappurisa*, 'the worthy man'; in doing so he describes the benefits that arise to those around him. The list of beneficiaries matches the recipients of the *pañca bali*; he is clearly referring to the ritual obligations of the householder.

> Seyyathāpi bhikkhave, mahāmegho sabbasassānusampādento bahuno janassa atthāya hitāya sukhāya hoti. Evameva kho bhikkhave, sappuriso kule jāyamāno bahuno janassa atthāya hitāya sukhāya hoti. Mātāpitunnaṃ atthāya hitāya sukhāya hoti. Puttadārassa atthāya hitāya sukhāya hoti. Dāsakammakaraporissa atthāya hitāya sukhāya hoti. Mittāmaccānaṃ atthāya hitāya sukhāya hoti, pubbapettānaṃ atthāya hitāya sukhāya hoti, rañño atthāya hitāya sukhāya hoti. Devatānaṃ

[44] Tassa ce gahapati ariyasāvakassa ime pañca bhogānaṃ ādiye ādiyato bhogā parikkhayaṃ gacchanti, tassa evaṃ hoti: ye vata bhogānaṃ ādiyā, te cāhaṃ ādiyāmi. Bhogā ca me parikkhayaṃ gacchantī"ti. Itissa hoti avippaṭisāro. Tassa ce gahapati ariyasāvakassa ime pañca bhogānaṃ ādiye ādiyato bhogā abhivaḍḍhanti, tassa evaṃ hoti: ye vata bhogānaṃ ādiyā, te cāhaṃ ādiyāmi bhogā ca me abhivaḍḍhantī''ti itissa hoti ubhayeneva avippaṭisāroti. *A* iii.46
Now, If the wealth of that Ariya disciple, heeding these five reasons, come to destruction, let him consider thus: At least, I've heeded those reasons for getting rich, but my wealth has gone!—thus he is not upset. And if his wealth increase, let him think: Truly, I've heeded those reaons and my wealth has grown—thus he is not upset in either case. (Hare)

atthāya hitāya sukhāya hoti. Samaṇabrāhmaṇānaṃ atthāya hitāya sukhāya hoti.
1. Bahunnaṃ vata atthāya sappañño gharamāvasaṃ,
Mātaraṃ pitaraṃ pubbe rattindivamatandito.
2. Pūjeti sahadhammena pubbe katamanussaraṃ,
Anāgāre pabbajite apace. Brahamacārayo
3. Niviṭṭhasaddho pūjeti ñatvā dhammedhapesale,
Rañño hito devahito ñātīnaṃ sakhinaṃ hito.
4. Sabbesaṃ so hito hoti saddhamme suppatiṭṭhito,
Vineyya maccheramalaṃ salokaṃ bhajate sivanti. *A* iv.244–245

Monks, when a worthy man is born into a family, it is for the good, benefit and happiness of many folk. It is for the good, benefit and happiness of his parents, of his wife and children, of his slaves, workmen and servants, of his friends and companions, of the ghosts of his forebears, of the rajah, of the devas, and of recluses and godly men.
Monks, just as abundance of rain brings to perfection all crops for the good, benefit and happiness of many folk; even so a worthy man is born into a family for the good, benefit and happiness of many folk…
Ah, well it is for the many when within
The home a wise man's born! Untiring, night
And day, he honours mother, father, forebears,
In fitting manner, mindful of their care
In former days. The homeless wanderers,
Who live the godly life, he honours, firm
In faith, he knows therefore things proper, right.
He is the rajah's friend and favorite,
The friend of devas, kith and kin and all.
Firm set in Saddhamma, with stain of stint
Put by, he wayfares to the world of bliss. (Hare)

The beneficiaries are: his mother and father, his son and wife, his acquaintances, friends, ancestors, the king, the gods, and ascetics. It cannot be coincidence that five of the nine groups in this list match the *pañca bali*. Further, I suggest that the others fall into a general conception of the householder's obligations that both Brahmins and Buddhists draw upon in their discursive compositions.

LANGUAGE, OVERLAP, AND THE NUMBER FIVE: THE *PAÑCA BALI* AND THE *PAÑCAMAHĀYAJÑA*

The significance of this review of the *pañca bali* lies in the similarity of these five obligations with the *pañcamahāyajña*. There are three commonalities that indicate the

relationship of these two formulas: the ritual language of their formulation; the number of elements: five; and the overlap in the content and the subject of the classification.

First and foremost is the language of the two sets; both make use of the ritual language to frame the doctrine of obligations. The Brahmanical theology uses the term *yajña*, sacrifice, whereas the Buddhist set uses the term *bali*, offering. Sacrifice as a currency for measuring something's value is a common trope in ancient Indian texts (Olivelle 1993, 54), thus labeling these sets in ritual terms takes advantage of the currency of ritual and ritual-oriented terms. Further, the Brahmanical authors use the term *bali* to refer to the fulfillment of the *bhūtayajña*, the sacrifice to beings.

The second feature is the number in each set: five. Olivelle suggests that, with respect to the *mahāyajña*, the number five probably comes from ancient five-fold division of sacrifice (1993, 54).[45] The significance of the number five could be drawn from any of a number of associations, but the significance in the ritual texts is clearly seen in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*.

> tā́ vā́ etā́ḥ | páñca vyā́hṛtayo bhavanty ó śrāvayā́stu śráuṣaḍ yája yé yájāmahe váuṣaḍ íti pā́ṅkto yajñáḥ pā́ṅktaḥ paśúḥ páñca rtávaḥ saṃvatsarásyaiṣáikā yajñásya mātráiṣā́ sampát | *ŚB* 1.5.2.16
>
> There are five utterances—"Make him hear!"; "Yes, he will hear!"; "Sacrifice…"; "We who sacrifice…"; "*Vaṣaṭ*…"—five-fold is the sacrifice, five-fold is the sacrificial animal, five are the seasons of the year, this is the only measure of the sacrifice; these are the (sacrifice) complete.

Ancient householders were certainly familiar with the number five and its association with ritual.[46] As this passage illustrates, the *śrauta* ritual was divided into five. In a

[45] Olivelle cites *TS* 5.4.7.2; 6.1.1.8; 6.1.5.2; 6.1.9.5; 6.2.1.3; *ŚB* 1.5.2.16; 4.5.1.14.

[46] It would also be interested to investigate whether there is any connection to the *pañcāgnividyā*, which would be particularly relevant to the discussion of the soteriological aspects of the householder life and ancestor worship in general in light of the two paths, *devayāna* and *pitṛyāna*, associated with knowledge of or ignorance about the *pañcāgnividyā*.

manner of speaking the *pañcamahāyajña* become the new five *śrauta* rituals, displacing the older paradigm of ritual with a new model.

In fact, I suggest that the passages examined at the beginning of this chapter that describe the householder's duties (*M* ii.186 and *MDhŚ* 3.72), point to a greater significance for the number five, namely that these expressions of the householder duties came to have a similar association with the number five. Additionally, my discussion of ancestor worship in the Pāli Canon will show that many of the elements seen in the aforementioned description of the householder life occur throughout the Pāli canon; the similarity of these sets of five, and their currency in describing the householder, could not have been lost on the texts' original audience.

Finally, the content of these two classifications suggest a deeper relationship than is immediately apparent. Despite the superficial differences in the formula, there seems to be considerable overlap in the object of each of these two lists; consider Table 5.

pañca bali		*pañcamahāyajña*
ñātibali	relatives	
atithibali	guest	manuṣyayajña
pubbapetabali	ancestors	pitṛyajña
rājabali	king	
devatābali	gods	devayajña
	beings	bhūtayajña
	Veda	brahmayajña

Table 5: Comparison of *pañca bali* and *pañcamahāyajña*.

While the differing contents indicate their different concerns about and demands on the householders, the differences in their formulations, discussed above, do not outweigh the similarities. These conceptions, the *pañcamahāyajña* and the *pañca bali*, were both reflections on the life of a householder, tailored to predominate contemporary formulas used in educated discourses about the householder. They grow to look alike because both

the Brahmins and Buddhists reflect upon householder life and employ similar discursive tools. They differ only because of the differing social milieu (e.g., *rājabali*) and differing discursive aims of the religious experts of each tradition (e.g., *brahmayajña*). With respect to the former, the Brahmins self conception expresses their independence from the temporal power of the king. This is seen clearly the Brahmins freedom from taxes, i.e., *rājabali*! In the end, the core of this ritual complex remains the same: guests, ancestors, and gods. A further discussion of the implications of the discursive similarities ends this chapter. Before that can adequately be addressed, the second ideological construction, the triple debt, and its Buddhist parallel, merits review.

This section addresses the conception of the householder's debts that are expressed as a debt, first the Brahmanical notion of the three debts, then an analogous expression in the Pāli Canon.

THE TRIPLE DEBT

This section addresses the Brahmanical notion of the three debts and the Buddhist reflection of that theological construction. Further, it aims to demonstrate the centrality of ancestor worship to the conception of the householder and show that the Brahmanical and Buddhist authors both engaged in a discourse of obligations which centered on the son and his obligations to his ancestors. This necessitates a review of the history of the conception of a triple debt. From the evidence of this review, I argue that the association of the triple debt with ancestor worship, *śrāddha* in particular, is an artifact of last few centuries before the Common Era. My aim in this section is to outline the reflections of both intellectual traditions on debt as an expression of ritual obligation and demonstrate the centrality of ancestor worship to those reflections as discursive attempts to define householder obligations.

Debt

In the oldest Vedic material *ṛṇa*, debt, has broad implications. Beyond the notion of a loan with the promise of repayment *ṛṇa* has implications of fault, crime, or guilt (Olivelle 1983, 48; Malamoud 1983, 22). While Malamoud argues that the last, "which carries a greater social charge, is also the one that must be considered primordial," he also suggests that the two meanings cannot be disassociated, a view Olivelle prefers. (Malamoud 1983, 22; Olivelle 1983, 48 n55). Debt also comes to refer to obligations, most relevant for us, ritual obligations (*ṚV* 4.3.13; *ṚV* 8.32.16; *AV* 6.119.2).[47]

However, the absence of any reference to three debts as a group and the debt to the Ṛṣis specifically raises the strong possibility that the triad may not have been a common trope in the earlier texts. While suggesting from the absence of any mention of the triple debt in the Vedic literature that the doctrine had not been formulated is an argument from silence, the importance it has in the latter tradition and its clear formulation in the Brāhmaṇa literature strengthen my suspicion that it is not an artifact of the *Ṛg Veda*, but of the Brāhmaṇa literature.

[47] The only example of the term *ṛṇa* in the *Ṛg Veda* that has any connection with progeny, is *ṚV* 6.61.1.

> iyám adadād rabhasáṃ ṛṇacyútaṃ dívodāsaṃ vadhryaśvā́ya dāśúṣe | *ṚV* 6.61.1
>
> She [Sarasvatī] gave to the donor of oblations, Vadhryaśva, a son: wild Divodāsa who acquits debt.

The debt to which the poet refers is not clear; it could refer to the economic debt that a son inherits from his father or the spiritual debt to the Pitṛs to have offspring. Olivelle suggests the latter is likely and concludes, "the view that considered sacrifice and offspring as debts to gods and forefathers, therefore, was considerably older and more widespread than the two texts of the *Yajurveda*—the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* and the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*—in which it finds systematic expression" (Olivelle 1983, 49). This is clearly indebted to a later understanding of debt in the Indian context. Stephanie Jamison (personal communication) offers another interpretation of the term *ṛṇacyutaṃ*, "who shakes the debtor". In this reading *ṛṇa* is a masculine derivative of *ṛṇa*, meaning debtor. The implication is that Dvidāsa either collects his father's debts or "shakes down" men as a ruffian. In the end the implications of this passage are ambiguous at best.

Another formulation of one's debt, appears to have held the Vedic imagination as much as the general conception of ritual as a debt to be repaid: ritual as a debt to Yama, a debt to death.

> apamítyam ápratīttaṃ yád ásmi yamásya yéna balínā cárāmi |
> idáṃ tád agne anṛṇó bhavāmi tváṃ pā́śān vicṛ́taṃ vettha sárvān || *AV* 6.117.1
>
> Of that which in me is borrowed, and not yet returned, of that tribute due to Yama that I carry with me hither and thither—of this debt, O Agni, would that I could free myself. Thou, thou knowest the art of untying all knots. (Malamoud)
>
> … yát kúsīdam || 1 ápratīttam máyi yéna yamásya balínā cárāmi | iháiva sán nirávadaye tád etát tád agne anṛṇó bhavāmi || … *TS* 3.3.8.1–2
>
> That debt in me which is unpaid, because of which I offer a tribute to Yama, in order to pay that back here in this world, I am free of this debt, O Agni.
>
> … kúsīdaṃ vā́ etád yamásya yájamāna ā́ datte yád óṣadhībhir védiṃ stṛṇā́ti yád ánupauṣya prayāyā́d grīvabaddhám enam || 3 amúṣmin loké nenīyeran yát kúsīdam ápratīttam máyīty úpauṣatīháivá sán yamáṃ kúsīdaṃ niravadā́yānṛṇáḥ suvargáṃ lokám eti … *TS* 3.3.8.3–4
>
> The sacrificer accepts this debt of Yama when he spreads the *oṣadhī* on the *vedi*; if he should go forth, having not burned, they lead him, bound by the neck, to the next world. When, saying "the unpaid debt in me…" he burns, in this world, having paid back his debt to Yama, he goes to the world of heaven free of debt.

From these passages it is clear that the metaphor of debt as an expression of one's ritual obligation is several times specifically formulated as a debt to Yama and that the sacrificer calls on Agni to mediate on his behalf. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* makes clear the nature of the relationship.

> ṛṇáṃ ha vái púruṣo jā́yamāna evá | mṛtyúr ātmánā jāyate sá yád yájate yáthaivá tát suparṇī́ devébhya ātmā́naṃ nirákrīṇītaivám evàiṣá etán mṛtyúr ātmā́naṃ níṣkrīṇīte | *ŚB* 3.6.2.16
>
> Right from birth man is born as a debt to death. When he sacrifices, as Suparṇin did, he buys himself back from the gods. He buys himself back from death.

The sacrificer is born burdened with a debt to death, a debt that he pays back by performing rituals. The specifics of this formulation echo the earliest formulations of the triple debt and I suggest this is no accident. The conception of ritual as payment for the

debt to Yama, one that must be repaid in order to enter heaven upon death, seems to have broader currency than the more general trope of ritual as a debt paid to the gods. There are two possible mechanisms for the repayment of this debt: 1. the process of performing ritual creates the capital to repay the debt and 2. transferring the debt to one's son relieves the sacrificer of it.

Malamoud argues that the performance of ritual creates a storehouse and this is the capital with which the debt is repaid. Additionally, ritual is often spoken of as a vehicle; in that vehicle the sacrificer travels to the world of the gods and "reserves a place in heaven that he will occupy for good after his death" (Malamoud 1983, 31). The world he wins upon death is that world he creates through sacrifice.

> táṃ kṛtáṃ lokáṃ abhí jāyate tásmād āhuḥ kṛtáṃ lokám púruṣo 'bhí jāyate íti | *ŚB* 6.2.2.27
>
> He is born into that world (he) made; therefore they say "A man is born into the world (he) made."

Malamoud suggests that the sacrificer's death is the repayment.

> If man is a borrowing being, if he holds in his possession goods that belong to death, he can only free himself by dying: buying back and disappearing become one and the same. To free himself without at the same time being destroyed, he must get Yama to accept a substitute of what he owes him: this he does with sacrifice (1983, 30).

By performing ritual the sacrificer "reserves a place in heaven" and when he dies he fulfills his debt to the gods and at the same time buys himself back from death (Malamoud 1983, 31).

This idea dovetails nicely with the vision of the next world painted in *ṚV* 10.14 in two ways. Firstly, in the funeral hymn Agni acts as the mediator and in *TS* 3.3.8.2, quoted above, the sacrificer calls on Agni to free him from debt. This may refer to Agni as the funeral fire, translating the dead from the world of debt to yonder world. Secondly, the

deceased is clothed in a new body in a world much like our own, matching Malamoud's vision of the establishment of one's world through ritual.

The other mechanism for relieving the sacrificer of his debt is to have a son, for with no son he has no world, i.e., he does not attain heaven.

> nāputrasya loko 'stīti tat sarve paśavo viduḥ | *AB* 7.13
> All beasts know there is no world for one without a son.

Further the sacrificer is free of his debt by having a son.

> anṛṇó yáḥ putrī́ | *TS* 6.3.10.5
> Free from debt is a man who has a son.

Another passage from the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* may indicate that the sacrificer's debt is transferred to his son.

> ṛnam asmin saṃnayaty amṛtatvaṃ ca gachati |
> pitā putrasya jātasya paśyec cej jīvato mukham || *AB* 7.13
> The father who sees his face of his son born living pays a debt in him and become immortal.

The verb *saṃ-√nī* poses a problem for the interpretation; it can mean 'to bestow' or 'to pay' (Olivelle 1983, 52); thus there is an ambiguity of whether the father's debt is paid up or transferred to his son. The later tradition chooses the latter interpretation (see my discussion of *MDhŚ* 9.106–107 below), but there is no definitive evidence to read this passage with one or the other interpretation.

I suggest that by using debt as a metaphor for one's ritual obligations—only one metaphor among many, as seen above—the authors of the Brāhmaṇas set the stage for the triple debt, which only appears later. The theology of three debts may be an synthesis of these several threads by some clever Brahmin. This probably accounts for Olivelle's impression that these formulations do not have the feel of innovation, but of common doctrine (Olivelle 1983, 49). The notion of debts is common, thus a set of debts would not seem new, merely collected.

The Triple Debt

With a general sense of debt in the Vedic texts, let us know turn to the classical formulations of the doctrine of three debts. The first clear expression of the doctrine of the triple debt appears in the *Taittrīya Saṃhitā*.

> … jā́yamāno vái brāhmaṇás tribhír ṛṇavā́ jāyate brahmacáryeṇá rṣibhyo yajñéna devébhyaḥ prajáyā pitṛ́bhya eṣá vā́ anṛṇó yáḥ putrī́ yájvā brahmacārivāsī́ … | *TS* 6.3.10.5
>
> Right from birth a Brahmin is born with three debts: (paid) to the Ṛṣis with studentship, to the gods with sacrifice, to the Pitṛs with offspring. Free from debt is the man who has a son, sacrifices, and lives as a student.

In the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, however, we find another formulation, involving four debts.

> ṛṇáṃ ha vái jāyate yó 'sti | sá jā́yamāna evá devébhya ṛ́ṣibhyaḥ pitṛ́bhyo manuṣyébhyaḥ | 1 sá yád evá yájeta | téna devébhya ṛṇáṃ jāyate tád dhy èbhya etát karóti yád enā́n yájate yád ebhyo juhoti | 2 átha yád evā́nubruvītá | tená rṣibhya ṛṇáṃ jāyate tád dhy èbhya etát karoty ṛ́ṣīṇāṃ nidhigopá íti hy ànūcānám āhuḥ | 3 átha yád evá prajā́m ichéta | téna pitṛ́bhya ṛṇáṃ jāyate tád dhy èbhya etát karóti yád eṣā́ṃ sáṃtatā́vyavachinnā prajā́ bhávati | 4 átha yád evá vāsáyate | téna manuṣyébhya ṛṇáṃ jāyate tád dhy èbhya etát karóti yád enā́n vā́sáyate yád ebhyó 'śanaṃ dádāti sá yá etā́ni sárvāṇi karóti sá kṛtákarmā tásya sárvam āptáṃ sárvaṃ jitáṃ | *ŚB* 1.7.2.1–5
>
> 1 He who exists, is born as a debt right from birth: to the gods, the Ṛṣis, the Pitṛs, and men. 2 Since he should sacrifice, therefore he is born a debt to the gods; indeed he does this for them in that he sacrifices to them, in that he offers to them. 3 Since he should recite, therefore he is born a debt to the gods; indeed he does this for them when he says the recitation, "Guardian of the treasure of the Ṛṣis." 4 Since he should desire offspring, therefore he is born a debt to the Pitṛs; indeed he does that for them in that there is continuous uninterrupted offspring for them. 5 Since he should provide shelter, therefore he is born a debt to men; he does that for them in that he shelters them, in that he gives them food. The one who does all this, he is one who has done what he has to do; he obtains everything, he conquers everything.

While the fact that the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* has four debts is significant, I wish to start by contextualizing these two formulations of the triple debt. The phrases employed in both formulations, I suggest, hint at the relationship of these expressions of the triple debt to the, probably, older debt to Yama.

ṛṇáṃ ha vái púruṣo jā́yamāna evá | mṛtyúr ātmánā jāyate … *ŚB* 3.6.2.16
… jā́yamāno vái brāhmaṇás tribhír ṛṇavā́ jāyate … *TS* 6.3.10.5
ṛṇáṃ ha vái jāyate yó ‘sti | sá jā́yamāna evá …*ŚB* 1.7.2.1–5

Despite the difference in the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* with respect to the order of the clauses, all three passages employ the same terms and share the same conception of a debt that is inborn in Brahmins. None of the relevant passages in the *Ṛg Veda* or the *Atharva Veda* construe the debt as inborn. This, I believe, is a feature of a newer conception of debt.

While debt probably always encompassed both the notions of a loan to be repaid and of fault or guilt, its application in the earliest texts only operates as a metaphor for obligation. When the authors of the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* and the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* employ it in the theology of the debt to Yama and the triple debt, they are not merely using it as a metaphor; it takes on metaphysical import. In the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, the obligation to perform ritual is no longer described as a debt, but the sacrificer is defined as a debt. His ritual behavior is no longer simply metaphorically imagined as a debt, it is a part of who he is; the obligation to perform ritual is inherent in his existence as a Brahmin.

Two significant implications for this theology need to be addressed. First, this theology makes presuppositions that are contradictory to the ideology of *karma*. "While the doctrine of *karma* insists that people reap what they sow, the doctrine of debts asserts that twice-born men become burdened with debts without any deliberate act on their part" (Olivelle 1983, 50). It is certain that the doctrine of the three debts was formulated long before the ideology of *karma* had any currency in the Vedic world, but its survival into

the later tradition is, nevertheless, quite interesting, because the tradition preserves two theological, even soteriological, stances that are contradictory in at least one respect.[48]

Second, and more significant for my argument, is that the debt to the ancestors is fairly circumscribed. The *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* defines the debt as offspring and its payment as a son. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* agrees that the debt is offspring, but specifies that the purpose of offspring is to ensure the continuation of their lineage. Thus the debt is repaid by the continuation of the family; there is no mention in these older texts that indicates that the fulfillment of this debt requires anything beyond having a son. Olivelle suggests that debt to the Pitṛs, even at this early stage, is connected to the performance of ancestor rites, because "one of the principal reasons for keeping the line unbroken is to ensure that these offerings, on which depend the felicity of the forefathers, are carried out without interruption" (1996, 54). But the texts do not evidence even an implicit connection between ancestor rites and the debt to the Pitṛs until the Dharmasūtras; further the first explicit connection of the debt to the Pitṛs with ancestor rites is in the *Mahābhārata*, which Olivelle himself quotes. I suggest that reading the debt to the ancestors as more than a continuation of the lineage is anachronistic. This is argued more fully below.

Purpose of the Triple Debt

The purpose of the theology of the triple debt, the social and discursive value of this doctrine, bears some discussion. The theology of the triple debt has the aim of "legitimizing the centrality of sacrifice and procreation and, consequently, of the married householder" (Olivelle 1993, 47). The doctrine is a reaction on the part of those authors

[48] This was part of the impetus for my dissertation; the popularity of the *śrāddha*, which presupposes an eternal heaven, persists despite the doctrine of reincarnation, which presupposes that all states except liberation are temporary. The tradition is rife with different strategies for reconciling, ignoring, or eliminating this apparent paradox, and I hope to lay the groundwork for further exploring this with this dissertation.

that advocated the ritual-centered lifestyle of the householder to the ascetic movement within the Brahmanical community that openly questioned the validity and end of ritual directly and indirectly the life based on ritual. While the arguments that question ritual do not occur in these texts, the ritualist Brahmins' reactions clearly indicate their anxiety about this ideological assault.

This opposition found expression in different genres of texts: the ritual texts advance strong arguments about the efficacy, in fact the inescapability, of ritual, while those composed by advocates of an ascetic lifestyle railed against ritual and praised the abandonment of all attachment to worldly things. The qualification for fulfilling one's debts are clear; while the first debt, to the Ṛṣis, presumes only an education, the other two, to the gods and the Pitṛs, presume that a man is married and engages in ritual. The notion of the three debts, then, defines the obligations of married, ritually active men. These ritual obligations, like real debts, create a network of social interdependences, but these interdependences include the full spectrum of beings in the world: gods, ancestors, seers, humans, and others (Olivelle 1983, 50).

The Triple Debt in the *sūtra* Literature

I have found only two references to debt in the Śrautasūtras; neither is more than a passing reference. Āśvalāyana quotes *Ṛg Veda* 6.61.1 as a *mantra* used during the sixth pressing day of the Soma Sacrifice (*ĀśŚS* 8.1.12). Śāṅkhāyana quotes *AB* 7.13, discussed above in a related context. The triple debt does not, however, appear in the Gṛhyasūtras. Its absence follows from the narrow scope of the texts, as seen above in the discussion of the *pañcamahāyajña*; neither of these genres are concerned with advocating the ritual life, they merely describe the rituals themselves.

Only two of the Dharmasūtras mention the triple debt: Baudhāyana and Vasiṣṭha.[49] Baudhāyana addresses the triple debt in his section on the *āśrama* system. He presents the opponent's arguments for the alternate modes of life—the lifetime student, the *vānaprastha*, the forest hermit, and the *parivrājaka*, the wandering ascetic—then says:

> aikāśramyaṃ tv ācāryā aprajanatvād itareṣām | *BDhS* 2.11.27
>
> There is, however, only a single order of life, the teachers maintain, because no offspring is produced in the others. (Olivelle)

That is, because the other *āśramas* prohibit procreation, the householder *āśrama* is the only vedically legitimate way of life. He then proceeds to produce proof by citing authoritative texts. Concluding the general discussion of the superiority of the householder *āśrama*, before moving on to specific duties, he says:

> prajābhir agne amṛtatvam aśyām | jāyamāno vai brāhmaṇas tribhir ṛṇavā jāyate brahmacaryeṇa ṛṣibhyo yajñena devebhyaḥ prajayā pitṛbhya iti | evam ṛṇasaṃyogavādinyo 'saṃkhyeyā bhavanti | 33
> trayīṃ vidyāṃ brahmacaryaṃ prajātiṃ śraddhāṃ tapo yajñam anupradānam |
> ya etāni kurvate tair it saha smo rajo bhūtvā dhvaṃsate 'nyat praśaṃsann iti |
> dhvaṃsate 'nyat praśaṃsann iti || *BDhS* 2.11.33–34
>
> 33 There are innumerable texts that refer to the debts that people incur, such as "Through offspring, O Fire, may we obtain immortality" (*ṚV* 5.4.10; *TS* 1.4.46.1); and "At his very birth, a Brahmin is born with a triple debt—of studentship to the seers, of sacrifice to the gods, and of offspring to the ancestors" (*TS* 6.3.10.5).
>
> 34 Study of the triple Veda, studentship, procreation, faith, austerity, sacrifice, giving gifts—those who perform these dwell with us. Anyone who praises other things becomes dust and perishes. (Olivelle)

In a similar vein Vasiṣṭha sings the praises of having sons. This discussion precedes the discussion of inheritance; this association between the triple debt and mundane debt inherited by a son occurs throughout the Brahmanical literature.

> ṛṇam asmin saṃnayati amṛtatvaṃ ca gacchati |
> pitā putrasya jātasya paśyet cej jīvato mukham || 1

[49] The passages from Baudhāyana employed in this section come from the portion of the text identified by Olivelle as "Proto-Baudhāyana" (2000, 191).

anantāḥ putriṇāṃ lokā nāputrasya loko ‘stīti śrūyate | 2
apajāḥ santvatriṇa ity abhiśāpaḥ | 3
prajābhir agne amṛtatvam aśyām ity api nigamo bhavati |
putreṇa lokāñ jayati pautreṇānantyam aśnute |
atha putrasya pautreṇa bradhnasyāpnoti viṣṭapam iti || *VDhS* 17.1–5

1 A debt he pays in him and immortality he gains, the father who sees the face of his son born and alive. (*AB* 7.13)

2 “Eternal are the worlds of those men who have sons. 3 A sonless man has no world”—so states a vedic text. And there is the curse: “May our enemies be childless!” 4 (*ṚV* 1.21.5). There is also the vedic saying: “Through offspring, O Fire, may we attain immortality” (*ṚV* 5.4.10).

5 Through a son one gains the worlds; through a grandson one attains eternal life; and through the son’s grandson one gains the crest of the sun. (Olivelle)

In addition to quoting Vedic sources, Vasiṣṭha adds examples that praise the value of sons: other Vedic statements and a curse. Finally, we see the escalation of what is won through a son; the value of offspring is extended to the subsequent generations: if a son is better, a grandson even more so, and a great-grandson is the ultimate achievement.

The other occurrences of the triple debt in Baudhāyana and Vasiṣṭha, however, demonstrate that the authors have made a new connection between the debt to the Pitṛs and the *śrāddha*.

āyuṣā tapasā yuktaḥ svādhyāyejyāparāyaṇaḥ |
prajām utpādayed yuktaḥ sve sve varṇe jitendriyaḥ || 3
brāhmaṇasya ṛṇasaṃyogas tribhir bhavati janmataḥ |
tāni mucyātmavān bhavati vimukto dharmasaṃśayāt || 4
svādhyāyena ṛṣīn pūjya somena ca puraṃdaram |
prajayā ca pitṝn pūrvān anṛṇo divi modate || 5
putreṇa lokāñ jayati pautreṇānantyam aśnute |
atha putrasya pautreṇa nākam evādhirohatīti || 6
vijñāyate ca | jāyamāno vai brāhmaṇas tribhir ṛṇavā jāyate brahmacaryeṇa ṛṣibhyo yajñena devebhyaḥ prajayā pitṛbhya iti | evam ṛṇasaṃyogaṃ vedo darśayati || 7
satputram utpādyātmānaṃ tārayati | 8
saptāvarān sapta pūrvān ṣaḍ anyān ātmasaptamān |
satputram adhigacchānas tārayaty enaso bhayāt || *BDhS* 2.16.3–9

3 Endowed with longevity, given to austerity, devoted to the recitation of his Veda and to sacrifice, and controlling his senses, a man should diligently beget offspring, each with his own class. 4 A Brahmin from his very birth becomes

saddled with three debts. After he has paid them, free from doubts regarding the Law, he becomes autonomous. 5 After a man has worshipped the seers by the recitation of the Veda, Indra with Soma sacrifices, and his ancestors with offspring, he will rejoice in heaven free from debt. 6 He wins the worlds through a son, attains eternal life through a grandson, and climbs to the very summit of heaven through his son's grandson. 7 It is, moreover, stated: "At his very birth a Brahmin is born with three debts—of studentship to the seers, of sacrifice to the gods, and of offspring to the ancestors" (*TS* 6.3.10.5). In this manner, the Veda points out that people are saddled with debts.
8 By fathering a virtuous son a man rescues himself.
9 A man who obtains a virtuous son rescues seven generations after him and seven generations before him—that is, six others with himself as the seventh, from sin and danger. (Olivelle)

avaśyaṃ brāhmaṇo 'gnīn ādadhīta | 45
darśapūrṇamāsāgrayaṇeṣṭicāturmāsyapaśusomaiś ca yajeta | 46
naiyamikaṃ hy etad ṛṇasaṃstutaṃ ca | 47
vijñāyate hi | tribhir ṛṇair ṛṇavān brāhmaṇo jāyata iti | yajñena devebhyaḥ prajayā pitṛbhyo brahmacaryeṇa ṛṣibhya ity eṣa vānṛṇo yajvā yaḥ putrī brahmacaryavān iti | *VDhS* 11.45–48

45 A Brahmin has the obligation to establish the sacred fires. 46 And he should offer the full-moon and the new moon sacrifices, the sacrifices of the first fruits, the seasonal sacrifices, the animal sacrifices, and the Soma sacrifices; 47 for this is specifically enjoined and is also acclaimed as a debt. 48 It is stated: "A Brahmin is born carrying three debts—of sacrifice to the gods, of offspring to the ancestors, and of studentship to the seers. That man is free from debts who has offered a sacrifice, fathered a son, and lived as a student." (Olivelle)

The context within the text is significant: both of these selections appear immediately after the sections on *śrāddha*. Baudhāyana places this discussion of offspring at the end of his description of the ancestral offerings; this section forms the end of the section on the duties of the householder, immediately preceding the rules for renunciation. This sequencing appears intentional and serves a specific purpose. From 2.4.16 to 2.11.8 he describes the primary duties of a householder's life, focusing primarily on ritual. From 2.11.9 to 2.11.34 he addresses the *āśrama* system, ending with the theology of the triple debt, which seals the judgment in the householder's favor. In the next two chapters he

describes more ritual behavior, offerings into the breath and eating.[50] Then he ends the section on the householder with the ancestral offerings and the centrality of offspring, driven home with the doctrine of the triple debt. He then moves on to discuss renunciation. By organizing his discussion of the householder in this way he makes the debt to the Pitṛs primary among the householder's duties. Vasiṣṭha too places this discussion at the end of his section on the *śrāddha*. While it follows a discussion of the *āśrama* system, it is not placed in such a pointed context as in Baudhāyana's work.

Both authors make an implicit connection between the debt to the Pitṛs and the *śrāddha* by organizing their texts as they did. I believe the association between the triple debt and the *śrāddha* is first made in this time frame and only becomes central to the conception of the householder's *dharma* in the later tradition.

The Triple Debt in the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*

In the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* the theology of the three debts appears an assumed part of a Brahmin's life cycle;[51] Manu fails to even define it, indicating its complete integration into the Brahmin conception of self. Thrice the fulfillment of the three debts is invoked as a qualification for advancement to a later *āsrama*, to retire:[52]

> maharṣipitṛdevānāṃ gatvānṛṇyaṃ yathāvidhi |
> putre sarvaṃ samāsajya vasen mādhyastham āsthitaḥ || *MDhŚ* 4.257
>
> After he has freed himself according to the rules from his debts to the great seers, ancestors, and gods, he should hand over everything to his son and live in complete equanimity. (Olivelle)

[50] For more on the offerings into the breath and the possible connection of this substitute for the Agnihotra with the *śrāddha*, see Bodewitz 1973, some of which I refer to in Chapter 3.

[51] The Dharmasūtras address themselves to the Brahmin as the paradigmatic householder, but this is merely a function of their ideological claim to speak for the whole tradition. That their construction of the householder is aimed at the Brahmin does not change the fact that they are defining the householder. This is clear from the fact that Brahmins in other *āśramas* are not bound by the rules of the householder's life; they have different ritual obligations.

[52] For Manu's use of the terms *saṃnyāsa* and *mokṣa* to denote retirement and renunciation respectively, see Olivelle 2005, 243 n 1.114.

daśalakṣaṇakaṃ dharmam anutiṣṭhan samāhitaḥ |
vedāntaṃ vidhivac chrutvā saṃnyased anṛṇo dvijaḥ || *MDhŚ* 6.94

When a twice-born man has followed the ten-point Law with a collected mind, learned the Vedānta according to the rule, and freed himself from debt, he may retire. (Olivelle)

And to become a renouncer:

ṛṇāni trīṇy apākṛtya mano mokṣe niveśayet |
anapākṛtya mokṣaṃ tu sevamāno vrajaty adhaḥ || *MDhŚ* 6.35

Only after he has paid his three debts, should a man set his mind on renunciation; if he devotes himself to renunciation without paying them, he will proceed downward. (Olivelle)

Manu need not define the triple debt; by his time this well-known doctrine merits mention without any qualification. The only other time Manu mentions the three debts is in connection to inheritance; in this he continues a long tradition that conflates all the debts of a man, financial and metaphysical.

Only that son who fulfills the debt to the ancestors is qualified to inherit his father's estate. The father passes to his son all mundane debt and property, but also the triple debt, specifically the debt to the Pitṛs is mentioned here with the same verb, *saṃ-√nī*, as the passages discussed earlier (*AB* 7.13, *ṚV* 8.47.17).

jyeṣṭhena jātamātreṇa putrī bhavati mānavaḥ |
pitṝṇām anṛṇaś caiva sa tasmāt sarvam arhati || 106
yasminn ṛṇaṃ saṃnayati yena cānantyam aśnute |
sa eva dharmajaḥ putraḥ kāmajān itarān viduḥ || *MDhŚ* 9.106–107

106 As soon as the eldest son is born, a person becomes "a man with a son" and is released from his dent to the ancestors; that son, therefore, is entitled to the entire amount. 107 Only that son to whom he passes on his debt and through whom he obtains immortality is born through the Law; others, they say, are born through lust. (Olivelle)

While Manu does not define the three debts, another contemporaneous text does: the *Mahābhārata*. Like Manu the authors of the *Mahābhārata* are concerned about *dharma*.

The Triple Debt in the *Mahābhārata*

In some respects the great epic is *dharma* literature as much as the Dharmasūtras and Dharmaśāstras. Additionally, the poetic medium affords more opportunity for waxing on about the triple debt and fosters a variety of formulations in the process. This section aims to illustrate the contemporaneous definition of the triple debt as well as the variety of its expression and details. Further this evidence will be used to show that the explicit association of the *śrāddha* with the triple debts is an artifact of this period.

Pāṇḍu and the Quest for More Sons

In the first book of the *Mahābhārata*, king Pāṇḍu mistakenly kills an ascetic who had taken the form of a deer to revel with his wife. Since Pāṇḍu shot the ascetic when he was engaging in love play with his wife, the ascetic curses Pāṇḍu to die the first time he has sex with his wife. Later, Pāṇḍu expresses his concerns about being unable to fulfill his debt to the Pitṛs if he is unable to have a son with at least one of his wives.

> pāṇḍur uvāca
> aprajasya mahābhāgā na dvāraṃ paricakṣate |
> svarge tenābhitapto 'ham aprajas tad bravīmi vaḥ || 11
> ṛṇaiś caturbhiḥ saṃyuktā jāyante manujā bhuvi |
> pitṛdevarṣimanujadeyaiḥ śatasahasraśaḥ || 12
> etāni tu yathākālaṃ yo na budhyati mānavaḥ |
> na tasya lokāḥ santīti dharmavidbhiḥ pratiṣṭhitam || 13
> yajñaiś ca devān prīṇāti svādhyāyatapasā munīn |
> putraiḥ śrāddhaiḥ pitṝṃś cāpi ānṛśaṃsyena mānavān || 14
> ṛṣidevamanuṣyāṇāṃ parimukto 'smi dharmataḥ |
> pitryād ṛṇād anirmuktas tena tapye tapodhanāḥ || 15
> dehanāśe dhruvo nāśaḥ pitṝṇām eṣa niścayaḥ |
> iha tasmāt prajāhetoḥ prajāyante narottamāḥ || *MBh* 1.111.11–16

> 11 Pāṇḍu said:
> For a man without children, O illustrious ones, they mention no door to heaven; tormented by this I tell you, I am without children. 12 Men are born on the earth burdened with four debts, which are to be paid to the Pitṛs, the gods, the Ṛṣis, and to men, by hundreds of thousands. 13 But a man who does not attend to these in due time has no worlds; this has been established by those who know *dharma*. 14

With sacrifice he propitiates the gods; with the austerity of the study of the Veda and austerities, the *munis*; with sons and *śrāddhas*, the Pitṛs; and with benevolence, men. 15 I am released from my (debt) to the Ṛṣis, gods, and men, according to *dharma*; but I am not released from by debt to the Pitṛs, therefore, ascetics, I am tormented. 16 When my body is destroyed, this will certainly mean the destruction of my Pitṛs. It is for the begetting of children that the best of men are born in this world.

According to the poet, one pays his debt to the Pitṛs by having sons *and* performing the *śrāddha*; this is the first explicit association of the debt to the Pitṛs with the *śrāddha*. However, this example is not isolated, nor is the debt always explicitly associated with having sons; frequently the association of having sons as a fulfillment of this debt is expressed only in the cultural assumption that one's son must perform the *śrāddha*.

That Paṇḍu describes the debt as four-fold is not unique, as we saw in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*; but the debt is four-fold elsewhere in the *Mahābhārata* as well. Significantly, the repayment is the performance of *śrāddha* alone.

ṛṇavāñ jāyate martyas tasmād anṛṇatāṃ vrajet || 9
svādhyāyena maharṣibhyo devebhyo yajñakarmaṇā |
pitṛbhyaḥ śrāddhadānena nṛṇām abhyarcanena ca || *MBh* 12.281.9–10

9 … A mortal is born bearing a debt, therefore he should attain to be debt free 10 by reciting the Veda for the Ṛṣis, by the act of sacrificer for the gods, by giving a *śrāddha* for the Pitṛs, and by praise of men.

The four-fold nature of the triple debt should not bother us, this is merely an aspect of the diverse nature of the *Mahābhārata*. Elsewhere, the debt is even said to have five parts.

ṛṇam unmucya devānām ṛṣīṇāṃ ca tathaiva ca |
pitṝṇām atha viprāṇām atithīnāṃ ca pañcamam || *MBh* 13.37.18

Having set oneself free from the five-fold debt: to the gods, the Ṛṣis, the Pitṛs, Brahmins, and guests.

The debt to the Pitṛs is frequently expressed as simply performing the *śrāddha*, but the primary association is that the two are inseparable. Only a son can perform the *śrāddha*, so you must have at least one son.

The importance of having children, specifically sons, to perform the proper rites to maintain you in heaven find expression in a particular narrative form, which I will call ‘The Hanging Fathers.” The paradigmatic narrative involves an ascetic who sees his ancestors hanging from tree roots or in a pit ready to fall. When he inquires as to their fate and how it befell them, his ancestors inform him that his failure to have a son doomed them to fall to hell. The moral of the story is that one cannot skip the householder stage; it is necessary.

Mandapāla and the Fruitless Trip to Heaven

Consider the story of Mandapāla, an upright and learned ascetic who dies without any children.[53]

> dharmajñānāṃ mukhyatamas tapasvī saṃśitavrataḥ |
> āsīn maharṣiḥ śrutavān mandapāla iti śrutaḥ || 5
> sa mārgam āsthito rājann ṛṣīṇām ūrdhvaretasām |
> svādhyāyavān dharmaratas tapasvī vijitendriyaḥ || 6
> sa gatvā tapasaḥ pāraṃ deham utsṛjya bhārata |
> jagāma pitṛlokāya na lebhe tatra tat phalam || 7
> sa lokān aphalān dṛṣṭvā tapasā nirjitān api |
> papraccha dharmarājasya samīpasthān divaukasaḥ || 8
> kimartham āvṛtā lokā mamaite tapasārjitāḥ |
> kiṃ mayā na kṛtaṃ tatra yasyedaṃ karmaṇaḥ phalam || 9
> tatrāhaṃ tat kariṣyāmi yadartham idam āvṛtam |
> phalam etasya tapasaḥ kathayadhvaṃ divaukasaḥ || 10
> devā ūcuḥ
> ṛṇino mānavā brahmañ jāyante yena tac chṛṇu |
> kriyābhir brahmacaryeṇa prajayā ca na saṃśayaḥ || 11
> tad apākriyate sarvaṃ yajñena tapasā sutaiḥ |
> tapasvī yajñakṛc cāsi na tu te vidyate prajā || 12
> ta ime prasavasyārthe tava lokāḥ samāvṛtāḥ |
> prajāyasva tato lokān upabhoktāsi śāśvatān || 13

[53] Similar stories, involving a young, childless ascetic’s ancestors hanging from a tree limb or in a pit, can be found at *MBh* 1.41.4f, 3.94–97, 9.49.55f, and 1.220–224. The first of these the ancestors are described as “bereft of food,” *nirāhāra*; this certainly refers to the food offered to ancestors in the *śrāddha* to sustain them in heaven.

punnāmno narakāt putras trātīti pitaraḥ mune |
tasmād apatyasaṃtāne yatasva dvijasattama || *MBh* 1.220.5–14

5 There was a learned great seer, foremost of those who know *dharma* and resolved in his vows, renowned as Mandapāla. 6 He abided on the path of seers, O king, holding up his seed, studying the Veda was devoted to the Law, austere, and had mastered his senses. 7 He went to the farthest shore of asceticism and, after he abandoned his body, O Bhārata, he went to the world of the Pitṛs, but he found no reward there.
8 Seeing his world without reward, despite having won them by his asceticism, he asked the divine denizens who surrounded Dharmarāja, 9 "Why, are these worlds that I won with my asceticism hidden from me? What did I fail to do that this should be the result of my deeds? 10 Tell me, O divine denizens, that, because of which the reward of this austerity is hidden, and I will do it."
11 The gods said, "Listen, Brahmin, to that by which men are born indebted, without a doubt: by rites, by being a *brahmacarya*, and by offspring. 12 One acquits oneself of all these with sacrifice, with austerity, and with sons. You are an ascetic and a sacrificer, but you have no offspring; 13 These worlds are closed to you because of this matter of offspring. Generate offspring and you will enjoy the eternal worlds. 14 A son saves his father from the hell called *Put*, O sage. Therefore, O best of twice-borns, you should work for an uninterrupted series of offspring."

This didactic tale continues the long tradition of ritualist authors advocating the householder life, in fact it seeks to use the narrative as a discourse to undermine the renouncer position that one can skip the householder stage.

The sketch of Mandapāla is drawn in the most praiseworthy language; he is learned and quite accomplished as an ascetic. As a part of his ascetic practice, he "held up his seed," a euphemism for retaining ones semen. Because he remained celibate, he lacks one thing: offspring. When he dies he goes to the *pitṛloka*, the world of the fathers, i.e., heaven, but the benefits he expects are missing; he finds fruitless worlds, *lokān aphalān*, despite thinking he had won them through ascetic practice. He asks the divine beings attending upon Dharmarāja, the god of the dead, why he finds no rewards and they reply by relating the three debts. This time there are three, though the list is not straightforward. There are three debts, the text says: to perform rites, to be a Vedic student, and to have

offspring, which are repaid with sacrifice, asceticism, and sons, respectively (verse 11).[54] Mandapāla has fulfilled the first two, sacrifice and asceticism, but he has failed to produce offspring. They then tell him that he will only enjoy eternal worlds by having sons. The gods conclude with a maxim that also appears in different wording in the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra.*

> putreṇa lokāñ jayati pautreṇānantyam aśnute |
> atha putrasya pautreṇa bradhnasyāpnoti viṣṭapam || 137
> puṃnāmno narakād yasmāt trāyate pitaraḥ sutaḥ |
> tasmāt putra iti proktaḥ svayam eva svayaṃbhuvā || *MDhŚ* 9.137–138
>
> 137 Through a son a man gains the worlds; through a son's son he obtains eternal life; but through a son's grandson he attains the crest of the sun. 138 The Self-existent One himself has called him "son" (*putra*) because he rescues (*trā*) his father from the hell named Put. (Olivelle)

Through the continuity of children he is saved from hell; through that continuity moreover he is fed in heaven through the *śrāddha*. Mandapāla reached heaven, the *pitṛloka*, but he failed to *properly* reach the *pitṛloka* because he did not have a son to perform the *śrāddha*.[55] The *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa* promotes the deceased father to the *pitṛloka*, and the author of this episode suggests that austerity cannot get you to the rewards that one stores in heaven awaiting their death by performing ritual. That the failure centers on

[54] While a full discussion of this alternate expression of the three debts is beyond the scope of the present discussion, it is worth noting several aspects of this passage. First, the term *brahmacarya* could be understood to imply the study of the Veda, thereby matching up with the debt to the Ṛṣis. This would suggest that the fulfillment of this debt, *tapas*, is a reinterpretation involving a shift of the primary association of study of the Veda to the austere nature of *brahmacarya* life. Second, the radically different terminology may imply an *ad hoc* interpretation of the triple debt rather than a calculated attempt to alter the paradigmatic formula. Third, the inclusion of the ancestor rites further supports my claim that ancestor rites are central to the conception of the householder. Finally, this association takes on more import in the *Mahābhārata* and the Purāṇas, as the narrative of the "hanging fathers" becomes more popular in the attempts to refute the renunciate claim that the householder stage is optional.

[55] Here the function of this narrative as a discursive tool that undermines the renunciate claim to a superior soteriological path is most clear.

śrāddha—moreover the fact that the connection I have supposed between the debt to the Pitṛs and *śrāddha* exists—is made explicit repeatedly in the *MBh*.[56]

These examples demonstrate that the conception of the three debts, though somewhat flexible, was an integral part of the conception of the proper householder life by the early centuries of the Common Era. Additionally, the association of the *śrāddha* with the debt to the ancestors, though not absolute, was thoroughly ingrained in the social imagination of that debt. This notion of debt was not exclusive to the Brahmanical ideological texts either, the Buddhists had similar concerns. Passages from the Pāli Canon illustrate a similar conception of ancestor worship as central to the conception of the householder and his debt to his ancestors.

BUDDHIST REFLECTIONS ON ANCESTOR WORSHIP

This section aims to show that ancestor worship is central to the Buddhist conception of the householder and that that obligation is expressed as an obligation. Though it is not explicitly described, as in the Brahmanical material, as a debt, the Buddhist expression of the obligation parallels the Brahmanical conception in important ways.

The *Ṭhānasutta* of the *Anguttara Nikāya*, includes several verses that integrate ancestor worship into a positive portrait of a householder.

> 12. Mātāpitukiccakaro puttadārahito sadā,
> Anto janassa atthāya ye cassa upajivino,
> 13. Ubhinnaṃ yeva atthāya vadaññū hoti sīlavā,
> Ñātīnaṃ pubbapetānaṃ diṭṭhadhamme ca jīvinaṃ,
> 14. Samaṇānaṃ brāhmaṇānaṃ devatānaṃ ca paṇḍito,

[56] Paṇḍu convinces each of his wives to conceive children out of fear of not having enough offspring to ensure the *śrāddha* is performed for him (*MBh* 1.115). The poets even put the argument for the importance of fulfilling this debt in the mouths of a daughter, who offers to give herself to the demon Baka so that her father and his ancestors will continue to offer the *śrāddha* (*MBh* 1.147). When Sāvitrī rescues her husband from Yama, he awakens and expresses his concern that his parents will be upset at his late return. The focus of their worry, he says, is that their *śrāddha* depends on him (*MBh* 3.281.85–87). This theme even occurs at the outset of the *Bhagavad Gītā* (*MBh* 6.23.42).

Vittisañjanano hoti dhammena gharamāvasaṃ.
15. So karitvāna kalyāṇaṃ pujjo hoti pasaṃsiyo.
Idha ceva naṃ pasaṃsanti pecca sagge ca modatī'ti *A* iii.78

12 One who does his duty to his mother and father,
who is a benefactor to his son and wife;
For the benefit of people inside his home and any who depend on him:
13 For the benefit of both he is straight of tongue
And possessed of moral character;
For relatives, ancestors, and those who live in this world,
14 For Samaṇas, Brāhmaṇas, and *devatās*, the wise man
Becomes one who produces prosperity, by the *dhamma*, in his abode.
15 Having done the moral good he becomes worthy of honor and praise;
Right here, in this world, do they praise him,
and he delights in heaven after he dies.

The author describes the praiseworthy householder, specifically including the religious activities that he engages in: supporting his family and doing his duties to relatives, ancestors, ascetics, and the gods.[57] Not only does the Buddhist author recognize that this man receives praise from his peers, but the verses extol the virtue of that householder. Additionally, they indicate that the reward of such moral character is heaven, just as the reward of performing *śrāddha* is heaven.[58] The performance of rites for one's ancestors, then, is a characteristic of a praiseworthy householder.

The Pāli Canon goes beyond a passive description of householder that includes the performance of householder rights, though; it includes a list of obligations incumbent upon a son that parallels the Brahmanical doctrine of the three debts as well as the *pañcamahāyajña*. An interesting passage in the *Anguttara Nikāya* expresses a concern with the obligations of a son, including the obligation to perform rites for ones' ancestors.

[57] This passage bears striking similarities to the *pañca bali* and the *mahāyajña*; for a discussion of these similarities see Chapter 4.
[58] I am not unaware that heaven is touted as the reward for most practices that an author desires to advocate, thereby increasing the desirability of such practices, but the association of heaven with performance of the *śrāddha* seems particularly strong.

A Son’s Obligations

In the *Puttasutta* of the *Anguttara Nikāya*, the Buddha discourses on the five things that cause a mother and father to desire a son.

> Pañcimāni bhikkhave ṭhānāni sampassantā mātāpitaro puttaṃ icchanti kule jāyamānaṃ. Katamāni pañca? Bhato vā no bharissati. Kiccaṃ vā no karissati. Kulavaṃso ciraṃ ṭhassati. Dāyajjaṃ paṭipajjati. Atha vā pana petātaṃ kālakatānaṃ dakkhiṇaṃ anuppadassatīti. Imāni kho bhikkhave pañca ṭhānāni sampassantā mātāpitaro puttaṃ icchanti kule jāyamānanti.
> Pañca ṭhānāni sampassaṃ puttaṃ icchanti paṇḍitā,
> Bhato vā no bharissati kiccaṃ vā no karissati.
> Kulavaṃso ciraṃ ṭhassati dāyajjaṃ paṭijjati,
> Athavā pana petānaṃ dakkhiṇaṃ anupadassati.
> ṭhānānetāni sampassaṃ puttaṃ icchanti paṇḍitā,
> Tasmā santo sappurisā kataññū katavedino,
> Bharanti mātāpitaro pubbe katam anussaraṃ,
> karonti nesaṃ kiccāni yathā taṃ pubbakārinaṃ
> Ovādakārī bhataposī kulavaṃsaṃ ahāpayaṃ,
> Saddho sīlena sampanno putto hoti pasaṃsiyoti. *A* iii.43–44[59]

> Considering five things, Monks, a mother and father desire a son born into the family. What are the five?
> Supported, he will support us; he will do what ought to be done; the family lineage will stand for a long time; he will worthily accept his inheritance; and he will administer the alms for the deceased who have died.
>> Considering these five things, Monks, a mother and father desire a son born into the family.
>> The wise, considering these five things, desire a son:
>> Supported, he will support us; he will do what ought to be done;
>> he will uphold the family lineage; he will worthily accept his inheritance;
>> and he will administer the alms for the deceased who have died.
>> Considering these things, the wise desire a son.
>> Therefore good men, peaceful, grateful, and mindful
>> Who support their mother and father, and remembering what was done in the past.
>> They do several things which ought to be done as it was done in the past.
>> One who does as he is advised, who supports and nourishes the family, without neglecting anything.

[59] The same text occurs at *D* iii.189, but the author omits the fifth reason.

> One dedicated to generosity (*saddha*), endowed with moral character is to be praised.

Of central importance for my argument is the initial list of the five things that make parents desire a son: 1. as the parents supported him growing up, so will he support them when they are old and unable to work; 2. he will do what ought to be done, i.e., he will perform his duty; 3. with his life, and by having more sons, the family lineage will continue; 4. he will worthily accept his inheritance; 5. and perform the rites for the dead, i.e., the ancestral offerings. This short *sutta* simply records this list with no comment on the Buddha's part, making it difficult to assign any judgment to the Buddhist author, but the lack of any overt criticism does tell us something, as with the other references discussed, this description of the ritual obligations of the householder goes unchallenged. Only the final line of the verses offers anything remarkable: that type of son is considered praiseworthy. The son who fulfills these duties receives praise in this Buddhist text; this implies that the fulfillment of these duties is viewed positively, to say the least.

The overlap with the Brahmanical material is striking; like the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* this *sutta* reflects a concern over the continuation of the lineage. Like the Vedic texts, this list shows a concern about the two aspects of the notion of inheritance, both material, the monetary inheritance and spiritual, the performance of ancestral rites. I suggest that the Buddhist conception of inheritance includes the father's debts as well, and others works are suggestive in this vein.[60] Both the urge to continue the lineage and the obligation to perform the rites for the dead could be interpreted as metaphysical obligations; which would parallel my discussion thus far of the debt to the Pitṛs. But, importantly, the Buddhist author does not employ the language of debt, and this is crucial, even if we accept the supposition that debt is implied in the inheritance. I believe that this

[60] Schopen has written on debt, monastic institution, and inheritance; see Schopen 2004.

terminological difference derives from the original context of the doctrine of the three debts, that is, a ritual context. The Buddhists rejected sacrificial terminology, e.g., *yajña*, especially, for my argument, in the context of *pañcamahāyajña*, for more general terms of ritual and giving, e.g., *bali* and verbal constructions with the verbal root √*dā* more generally. Similarly the absence of terms for debt can be seen as a rejection of the theological import of debt as conceived by the Brahmins. The inborn nature of the obligation to perform ritual would be anathema to the Buddhist authors, thus they would soften their expression of one's ritual obligations.

Even if the reader is unwilling to accept this stronger formulation, it can be expressed in a weaker form.[61] If the notion that the Buddhist authors intentionally softened Brahmanical language assumes an uncomfortable deep reading of the authors' intent, it can still be posited that the conception of the obligation to perform the ancestral rites is there in the Buddhist canon and, further, it parallels the Brahmanical concept in very important ways, specifically the connection between inheritance, lineage, and the obligation to perform the ancestral rites.

Having reviewed the theological conceptions that address the householder's ritual obligations, I now reflect upon the import of the similarities illustrated and endeavor to show that these similarities are not coincidence, but indicative of the interpenetrating nature of the Brahmanical and Buddhist discourses more generally.

[61] The notion of one's obligations to the ancestors is expressed in a Buddhist text, at least once. Quoting Olivelle, as above, in a discussion of debt in the Buddhist context, Schopen says, "The redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, the text we will be most concerned with here, clearly new something of this brahmanical anthropology. For example, the father of a new-born son is repeatedly said in this *Vinaya* to declare to his wife, in a narrative cliché, *bhadre jāto 'smākam ṛṇadharo dhanaharaḥ*, which in spite of Edgerton (s.v. *ṛṇadhara*), and in light of far more occurrences than he knew and their Tibetan translations, must mean "My dear, (both) a remover of our debt (and) a taker of our wealth has been born to us". He gives the following citations for the Sanskrit occurrences: the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* in Dutt 1984, v3 p1 87 and the *Pravajyāvastu* in Dutt 1984 v3 p4 54 (2004, 159 n1)

PAÑCAMAHĀYAJÑA AND TRIPLE DEBT: DISTINCT DISCURSIVE THREADS

The preceding review of the three debts in the Brahmanical material suggests a significant development in the specific associations of the debt to the Pitṛs. The earliest expressions of the debt to the Pitṛs indicate that this debt is repaid by having sons; the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* is explicit as to the purpose, to continue the lineage (*ŚB* 1.7.2.4). The texts do not evidence even an implicit connection between ancestor rites and the debt to the Pitṛs until the Dharmasūtras, as shown above. The first explicit connection of the debt to the Pitṛs with ancestor rites is in the *Mahābhārata*, as Olivelle himself notes. I assert that the connection of the ancestral rituals with the triple debt is an artifact of the later period. It may be suggested that this assertion is an argument from silence and this is true to some extent, but I believe that the collocation of these theological constructs in the same discourses and explicit parallels made between other ideological schemes, e.g., Manu's consolidation of the *pañcamahāyajña* and the '*huta* scheme', suggest that the connection to the ancestor rites would have been easily seen and likely expressed, were it made. The *mahāyajña* theology specifically uses the conception of sacrifice to express religious obligations. Olivelle expresses it well:

> This theology is one more instance of the common tendency in Brāhmaṇism to conceive of any activity of value in terms of sacrifice. We have seen already the extension of the concept of sacrifice to procreation. "Sacrifice" becomes the currency for appraising the value of an activity. In later literature many religious and devotional acts, and even military heroism, are measured by that currency; one practice may be worth a hundred Soma sacrifices, and another a thousand horse sacrifices. (Olivelle 1993, 54)

I suggest that the ideologies of the three debt and the great sacrifices were two contemporaneous doctrinal discourses for legitimating, indeed defining, the religious obligations of the ritually active householder. Further both sought to construct the social reality of ritual behavior in such as way as to imbed these ritual obligations in the definition of what it meant to be a Brahmin.

Even if there were a tacit understanding that the debt to the Pitṛs had the implication of continued ancestor worship, it is significant that the authors chose not to express that obligation explicitly as the need to perform the ancestral rituals, as the authors of the doctrine of the great sacrifices did. Surely the ancient Brahmins took notice of the analogies between the three debts and the great sacrifices that numerous scholars have pointed out (Olivelle 1993, 53; Devasthali 1965, 100; Malamoud 1983, 28). Further both ideologies emphasize the interdependent nature of the world as it is re-imagined through these lenses. The ritualist now belongs to a "web of interdependent relationships which create reciprocal rights and obligations" (Olivelle 1993, 50). The ritualist is the nexus of the food cycle that includes gods and Pitṛs and later traditions take this to indicate the superiority of the householder class; he produces, he procreates, he sustains the world (Olivelle 1993, 55).

However, it is telling that there is no Brahmanical attempt to reconcile these until a much later period; the categories don't begin to overlap until the *Mahābhārata*, as we have seen. This derives partly from the orientation of the obligations expressed in each theology. Whereas the three debts indicate life-long obligations in a general way, the great sacrifices are daily obligations.[62] These two doctrines were two of many threads woven through the Brahmanical literature; they were two arguments for the importance of the householder and of ritual. Each independently legitimated and naturalized the obligation to perform ritual, and the theologians simply never felt the need to combine them, despite their similarities. But these discursive threads operated and were deployed within the same discursive space, a space which included Buddhist ideologues.

[62] For a discussion of the reality of the daily nature of the *mahāyajñas*, the obligation to guests in particular, see Gonda 1980, 413f.

HOUSEHOLDER IN RELIGIOUS DISCOURSE: A SHARED DISCURSIVE SPACE

Scholars of both traditions sought to define the householder and his ritual obligations; the ideologies discussed in this chapter are the meat of those discursive efforts. Most important, both traditions reacted to a shared conception of the householder life. Not only did they share the raw material of their ideological constructions, but they engaged that material in nearly identical ways, differing only on ‘proprietary’ matters, which were the key to the identities that the theologians were trying to establish, e.g., the Veda as central to Brahmanical self-conception.

Both traditions employed ritual terminology to describe the householder’s obligations, for example the *pañcamahāyajña*, the ‘*huta* scheme’, and the *pañca bali*. Further the similarity of the content of these lists suggests a shared source and a lack of concern that these categories intersected. Both traditions used the trope of sacrifice to define the ritual obligations, but there were differences in the application. Whereas the Brahmins inherit and reinforce the sacrificial association with the term *yajña*, the Buddhists shift the emphasis from sacrifice to offerings by using the term *bali*. They remain in the realm of sacrifice-oriented language, but reiterate their objection to sacrifice, by shifting the terms of the discourse to ritual more generally. While Manu aims to define in great detail the ritual obligations of the householder, the Buddhist authors aim to show that Buddhist practice is not at odds with the householder lifestyle. Manu, and other *dharma* literature authors, employ the *mahāyajña* to advocate and validate a particular lifestyle: ritually active life in the householder *āśrama*. The Buddhist authors employ their similarly constructed notion of the householder’s obligations for a different aim: to indicate that the Buddhist ideas they advocate do not interfere with the normal aspects of householder life; one can be a householder and a Buddhist with no sense of conflict. The point is significant for better understanding the social reality of the

times; the categories 'householder,' even a 'Brahmin householder,' and 'Buddhist' are not mutually exclusive categories. The Buddhist authors simply express a general conception of the householder's daily obligations.

Both traditions employ the metaphor of debt to express the householder's ritual obligations. The comparison of the notion of the son's debts to his ancestors in the Brahmanical and Buddhist material illustrates the interdependency well.[63] The *Puttasutta* of the *Anguttara Nikāya* ties together the material inheritance, the continuation of the lineage, and the duty to perform the ancestral rites. Only the first two of these are explicitly connected in the earliest Brahmanical literature. Once again the absence of the third, rites to the ancestors, in an explicit formulation in the Brahmanical literature is an argument from silence, but the collocation of these three in the Pāli Canon suggests two things: 1. its absence in the Brahmanical literature may not be accidental and 2. there may be some extra-Brahmanical precedent for the later associations between the debt to the Pitṛs and the ancestor rites made in the *dharma* literature. With respect to the former, that the centrality of the ancestral rites to the *pañcamahāyajña* and its lack of emphasis in the triple debt, may be a factor of the distinct nature of these two ideological constructions, i.e., ancestor worship was not expressed explicitly as a part of the triple debt, because it had such a central place in the *pañcamahāyajña*. As for the latter, it is beyond the scope of this study to speculate on the direction of influence, as mentioned above when quoting Doniger, but the absence of such an association in the Buddhist material, at least highlights the interrelated nature of the two traditions, at best suggests an avenue for further inquiry into the specifics of that interrelatedness. In the end, the material in both

[63] While I am unable to puzzle out in any detail the temporal relationship of the Brahmanical and Buddhist reflections on this particular householder obligation, since it is not possible to establish the relative priority of the texts in one tradition to the texts of the other tradition, this work, the following argument in particular, may begin to offer clues to establish such a dating.

traditions on the debt of the son does support my assertion that religious experts of both traditions occupy the same discursive space.

Being unable to determine decisively the temporal relation of specific texts does not diminish the significance of the connection I have established; the Brahmanical and Buddhist scholars are both reflecting on the nature of being a householder and engaging the idea of what is means to be a proper householder. Though they aim at different ends, the religious experts of both traditions share many things: 1. a basic conception of the householder's ritual obligations, 2. an attitude toward the value, both material and spiritual, of the householder to society, 3. an appropriative stance toward the householder, 4. similar vocabulary and tropes, and 5. the same intellectual space. The Brahmin and Buddhist authors responded to shared conceptions of the householder and his duties with a similar attitude and ideological tools within the same discursive space in an effort to construct a notion of the 'proper householder'. In short, scholars of both traditions sought to define the householder life, and its obligations, to give primacy to their own mode of interaction and their role as religious expert. For the Brahmins this was as an intellectual reservoir of the tradition and as honored guests who lent efficacy to the rite performed and pronounced it a success.[64] The Buddhists took on a similar role, developing the notion that the Saṅgha is a field of merit, in which gifts fructify for the giver. Both of these are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4.

Finally, the evidence presented to demonstrate the collocation of the Brahmin and Buddhist religious experts with respect to the householder, also evidences the centrality of the ancestral rites to both traditions' definition of the householder's ritual obligations. Despite the variety in expressions of each of the ideological schema, ancestor worship

[64] See my section on the Gṛhyasūtras where the *sūtrakāra* instructs the householder to have the Brahmin state that the day, i.e., the event, has been meritorious, e.g., *HGS* 2.7.17.13.

was central to each trope discussed, e.g., the triple debt, which is often expressed in numbers other than three. The centrality of the ancestral rites among the ritual obligations grew with the popularity of the *śrāddha*; this is demonstrated both by the increase in material dedicated to this ritual obligation above the others in the Dharmasūtras and by the preponderance of narratives that advocate ancestor propitiation as central to one's fulfillment of one's *dharma*. The increased fervor with which the ritualist authors advocate the ritual life of the householder over that of the renunciate certainly also played a role in this development. Further, the later discussion will add to this in demonstrating the centrality of ancestor worship to householder religion.

Chapter 2: Ancestor Worship

In order to prove my second thesis—that a central aim of the Brahmin and Buddhist ideological construct of the proper householder was to secure the role of mediator—this study focuses on one of the householder's manifold ritual obligations. For reasons stated in the Introduction, I have chosen to examine the rituals of ancestor propitiation. This chapter reviews the historical development of ancestor worship in South Asia, from its earliest occurrence in the *Ṛg Veda* to a time of its centrality to the *dharma* of a householder in the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* and is divided into five sections: 1. Vedic ancestor worship, 2. ancestor worship in the *saṃhitā* literature, 3. domestic ancestor worship, 4. ancestor worship in the *dharma* literature, and 5. Buddhist conceptions of ancestor worship. My approach to these sections advances roughly chronologically: The isolated nature of the references to ancestor worship in the *Ṛg Veda* necessitates beginning with a summary of the ancestral rites, the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* and the *pitṛyajña*, as they are described in the Brāhmaṇas and the Śrautasūtras. This review contextualizes the references to ancestor worship in the poetic liturgy of the *Ṛg Veda* and *Atharva Veda*, and in this light the conception of ancestral propitiation in the oldest literature is understood better.[65] The *śrauta* tradition of the Brāhmaṇas and the Śrautasūtras undergoes considerable modification in the Gṛhyasūtras, records of the domestic ritual. These rites borrow heavily from the *śrauta* tradition, but introduce concepts absent in the earlier literature, e.g., meat offerings and the centrality of feeding Brahmins at the ancestor rites. Additionally, in these texts the ancestral offerings are first called the *śrāddha*, the term

[65] There is a danger in employing the later tradition to understand the earlier texts, but the lack of evidence (the *Ṛg Veda* after all gives us few clues, as will be shown) requires that we use the later material to give us some hint of the older ritual. I am careful to avoid anachronistic projections onto the older ritual as far as I am able.

that defines ancestor worship for all subsequent traditions. From the classical formulations of the *śrāddha*, I turn to the *dharma* literature, primarily the Dharmasūtras and the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*, to briefly describe the character of and new prominence given to ancestor worship. The *dharma* tradition's treatment of *śrāddha* receives more attention in the next chapter. This chapter concludes with a review that evidence a strong tradition of ancestor veneration in the early Buddhist tradition in India.

VEDIC ANCESTOR WORSHIP

The Brāhmaṇas provide us with a rich storehouse of information about ancestor worship in ancient South Asia; they give us both the earliest clear reference to the details of the ancestor worship and mythic explanations of its rituals. The former helps us understand the logistics of the ritual as well as the dynamics of the relationship between the Pitṛs and their descendents. The latter helps us understand what these rituals meant to those that recorded them. This chapter is concerned with the ritual itself, while the ideological implications in these rituals are discussed in Chapter 3.

The Brāhmaṇas and the Śrautasūtras frequently share considerable details of the descriptions of the rituals discussed; thus I draw upon both genres to create a composite summary of the Vedic ancestral rites. Since my main purpose in this chapter is to provide the background for the larger argument of my dissertation, differences between different *śākhās* or on the details that appear in the Śrautasūtras but are absent in the Brāhmaṇas do not receive extensive treatment.[66] The focus is on the most basic paradigm of the ritual.[67]

[66] More often than not the Śrautasūtras include details not mentioned in the Brāhmaṇa of the same *śākhā*; contradictory instructions are rare.
[67] By necessity this creates a "lowest common denominator" of the ritual; while not faithful in detail to any one text, it will suffice for understanding the historical development and socio-religious implications to be drawn the interpretation of the ancestor rites.

The Vedic ritual materials describe two types of ancestor ritual: the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* as a part of the new and full moon sacrifices, *darśapūrṇamāseṣṭi*, the new and full moon sacrifices,[68] and the *pitṛyajña* as a part of the Sākamedha sacrifice, one of three seasonal sacrifices called the *cāturmāsyas*.[69] Each ritual is described, since differences are significant to understanding the historical development of the rituals, and briefly contextualized in the larger ritual setting, particularly the differences between divine and ancestral rites. The implications of the differences between the two rituals follow. I leave an explanation of the purpose of the ritual to a later chapter.

***piṇḍapitṛyajña*: A Summary**

The *piṇḍapitṛyajña* is performed once a month in the afternoon of the new moon.[70] The sacrificer sits behind the *gārhapatya* fire, the domestic fire, facing the south wearing his sacrificial cord over his right shoulder, *prācīnāvītin*.[71] (Wearing the sacrificial cord over the right shoulder contrasts to wearing it over the left shoulder, *yajñopavītin*; the former is appropriate for rites aimed at the ancestors, the latter for rites aimed at the gods.) He prepares the ritual space by spreading *darbha* grass on the ground and placing the necessary equipment next to the southern fire.[72] The sacrificer's wife winnows rice grains on a black antelope's skin laid out to the west of the southern fire.[73] The Adhvaryu boils the rice over the southern fire and makes an offering of clarified butter into the rice.[74]

[68] Specifically, the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* belongs to the new moon sacrifice.
[69] The term *piṭryajña* translates literally as 'sacrifice to the fathers and the addition of *piṇḍa* would render 'sacrifice to the fathers of rice-balls.'
[70] …māsí māsy evá pitṛ́bhyo dádato yádáivaiṣá ná purástān ná paścā́d dadṛśé 'thaibhyo dadāty … *ŚB* 2.4.2.7, sá vā́ 'parāhṇé dadāti … *ŚB* 2.4.2.8; *ĀpŚS* 1.7.1; *KŚS* 4.1.1; *ĀśŚS* 2.6.1
[71] sá jaghánena gā́rhapatyam | prācīnāvītī́ bhūtvā́ dakṣiṇā́sīna … *ŚB* 2.4.2.9
[72] *ĀpŚS* 1.7.5; *TS* 1.6.8.2
[73] *ĀpŚS* 1.7.10; *KŚS* 4.1.4–5 describes the Adhvaryu threshing the grains.
[74] tā́ṃ śrapayati | tásminn ádhiśrita ā́jyam práty ā́nayaty agnáu … *ŚB* 2.4.2.10; *ĀpŚS* 1.7.12–8.1; *KŚS* 4.1.1

Upon removing the rice from the fire he offers two libations to the gods into the fire.[75] He then recites *mantras* to Agni and Soma and makes an offering for each into the fire.[76]

Then with the wooden sword he draws a line south of the fire, which takes the place of the altar.[77] To ward off *asuras* and *rakṣas*, who can tamper with the food offered to the Pitṛs, the sacrificer lays down a firebrand at the south end of that line.[78] With an accompanying *mantra* he asks Agni to expel the *rakṣas*.[79] He then makes the Pitṛs wash themselves, as he would a guest about to eat; he takes a water pitcher and pours out the water saying "<Father's name>, wash yourself." He then does the same with his grandfather and great-grandfather, using their names.[80] He cuts the sacrificial grass with one stroke and spreads the grass along the line with their tops toward the south.[81]

Then he offers the *piṇḍas* to the Pitṛs on the grass with the phrase "<Father's name>, this is for you,"[82] repeating the process for his grandfather and great-grandfather.

75 sá udvā́syāgnau dvé ā́hutī juhoti devébhyaḥ … *ŚB* 2.4.2.11

76 *ŚB* 2.4.2.12–13; *ĀŚS* 1.8.3–4, Āpastamba includes an oblation to Yama, but recognizes that not all schools call for this. Unlike the Brāhmaṇas, Āpastamba instructs the Adhvaryu to switch his sacred thread for these two divinely-oriented oblations. The only other mention of this in a discussion of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* appears in *ĀśŚS* 2.6.13, where an option is given with regard to the offering to Agni Kavyavāhana: the offering may be made, having switched the sacred thread and using *agni kavyavāhanāya svāhā* instead of the customary *agni kavyavāhanāya svadhā namaḥ*. *BŚS* 3.10 mentions this too, in the same context. I suggest these evidence influence from the *pitṛyajña*.

77 … átha dákṣiṇenānvāhāryapácanaṃ sakṛ́d úllikhati tád vedibhājanáṃ … *ŚB* 2.4.2.13; *ĀpŚS* 1.8.8; *KŚS* 4.1.7

Again this action occurs only once because the fathers died only once, *ŚB* 2.4.2.13.

78 átha parástād úlmukaṃ nídadhāti | sá yád ánidhāyólmukam áthaitát pitṛ́bhyo dadyā́d asurarakṣasā́ni haiṣām etád vímathnīrā́ṃs tátho … *ŚB* 2.4.2.14; Āpastamba does not include this injunction.

79 *ŚB* 2.4.2.15

80 áthodapātrámādāyā́ 'vanejayati | ásāvaváne nikṣvétyeva yájamānasya pitáram ásāvávane nikṣvéti pitāmahám ásāvávane nikṣváti prápitāmaháṃ tád yáthā 'śiṣyáté 'bhiṣiñcé deváṃ tát *ŚB* 2.4.16; *ĀpŚS* 1.8.10–12

81 *ŚB* 2.4.2.17–18; *ĀpŚS* 1.9.1

82 … tátra dadāti sa …*ŚB* 2.4.2.18; sá dadāti | ásāv etát ta íty evá yájamānasya pitré … *ŚB* 2.4.2.19

Enjoining them to enjoy the food, he turns his back to allow them to eat.[83] He again pours water, washing the Pitṛs as he did before,[84] reinforcing the fact that they consume the meal. After the offering of *piṇḍas*, he offers collyrium, ointment, a mat, and a pillow.[85]

He then pulls down the tuck of his sacrificial garment and pays them homage.[86] In the Śrautasūtras, this act of holding onto the fringe of his garment is transformed; a thread from his garment, or a piece of wool, or, if he is older, a body hair, is placed on the *piṇḍas* while the Pitṛs are praised.[87] He then places the *piṇḍas*, of which the Pitṛs have partaken, back in the dish containing the remains of the boiled rice and smells the rice; through smelling the rice he too partakes in the rice.[88] Another innovation found only in the Śrautasūtras gives the sacrificer an option of feeding the second *piṇḍa*—which is dedicated to his grandfather—to his wife, should she desire a son.[89] He finally disposes of

83 tátra japati | átra pitaro mādayadhvaṃ yathābhāgám ā́vṛṣāyadhvvam íti yathābhāgám aśnītéty evàitád āha *ŚB* 2.4.2.20; átha párāṅ paryā́vartate … *ŚB* 2.4.2.21; *ĀpŚS* 1.9.10–11

The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* also explains that men, the gods, and the Pitṛs eat together, but without seeing each other, whereas in the past they did so visibly:

> té ha smaitá ubháye devamanuṣyā́ḥ pitáraḥ sámpibanté sáiṣā́ sampā té ha sma dṛśyámānā evá purā́ sámpibanta utáitar hy ádṛśyamānāḥ | *ŚB* 3.6.2.26
>
> And verily both the gods and men, and the Fathers drink together, and this is their symposium; of old they drank together visibly, but now they do so unseen. (Eggeling)

84 *ŚB* 2.4.2.23, which is identical to 16; *ĀpŚS* 1.9.14

85 *ĀpŚS* 1.9.15–17; *KŚS* 2.6.11 mentions laying out all four at the beginning of the ritual, but 2.7.5 only mentions the ointment; that is indicates is to be spread on the *piṇḍas*; *BŚS* 3.10 mentions laying these out at the beginning and 3.11 includes their offering to the Pitṛs.

86 átha nīvím udvṛ́hya námas karoti … *ŚB* 2.4.2.24

This part of the ritual is different in the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*. That text uses the term *daśā* and the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* uses the term *nīvi*, but Sāyana glosses *nīvim udvṛhya* at *ŚB* 2.4.2.24 with the phrase *paridhānīyasya vāsaso daśā tām udvṛhya visramsya*, "Having drawn out, i.e., having unfastened the fringe of his undergarment." The differences appear to follow the *śākhās*, though the association with clothing, which I will discuss below, is the same.

87 *ĀpŚS* 1.10.1; *KŚS* 4.1.16–18; *KŚS* 2.7.6

88 …'thā́vajighrati pratyavadhā́ya píṇḍānt sá yajamānabhā́go … *ŚB* 2.4.2.24

89 *ĀpŚS* 1.10.10–11; *KŚS* 2.7.12–13; and

the sacrificial grass in the fire and throws away the firebrand, concluding the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*.[90]

piṇḍapitṛyajña: An Interpretation

Many of the details point to the significant differences characteristic of the distinction between rituals to the gods and rituals to the Pitṛs. In the preamble to the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*, the author introduces the gods as *yajñopavītin*, wearing the sacred thread on the left shoulder (*ŚB* 2.4.2.1), and the Pitṛs as *prācīnāvītin*, wearing the sacred thread on the right shoulder (*ŚB* 2.4.2.2). The sacrificer—who is specifically enjoined to wear his thread in the latter fashion in *ŚB* 2.4.2.9—wears his thread in a manner appropriate for each in divine and ancestral rituals.

The sacrificer should sit facing the south, the direction associated with death and the dead (Smith 1994, 142–144), as opposed to the usual orientation for ritual, i.e., the east,

ādhatteti madhyamapiṇḍaṃ patnī prāśnāti putrakāma || *KŚS* 4.1.22
If he desires a son, his wife should eat the middle *piṇḍa* with "Bestow…(*VS* 2.33, see below)"

vīram me datta pitara iti piṇḍānām madhyamam || 12
patnīm prāśayed ādhatta pitaro garbham kumāram puṣkara srajam | yathā ayam arapā asad iti || *ĀśŚS* 2.7.12–13
12 The middle *piṇḍa* with, "Give me a son, O Pitṛs!"
13 He should cause his wife to eat (it) with, "Bestow upon me a child, a son garlanded in lotuses, so that this one will be free from disease." (this is a modified version of *VS* 2.33)

apāṃ tv auṣadhīṇāṃ rasaṃ prāśayāmi bhūtakṛtaṃ garbhaṃ dhatsveti madhyamaṃ piṇḍaṃ patnyai prayacchati || 10
ādhatta pitaro garbhaṃ kumāraṃ puṣkarasrajam | yatheha puruṣo 'sid iti taṃ patnī prāśnāti pumāṃsaṃ ha jānukā bhavatīti vijñāyate || *ĀpŚS* 1.10.10–11
10 He offers the middle *piṇḍa* to his wife with, "I feed (her) the sap of the water plant; place a child made into a being."
11 His wife should eat it, with "Bestow upon me a child, a son garlanded in lotuses, so that there will be a man here," thinking, "I am bring forth a man."

ādhatta pitaro garbhaṃ kúmāraṃ puṣkarásrajam | yathehá pursuṣó 'sat || VS 2.33
Bestow upon me a child, a son garlanded in lotuses, so that there will be a man here.

[90] … 'gnáu sakṛ́d ā́cínnā́ny abhyā́dadhāti púnar úlmukam ápi sṛjati *ŚB* 2.4.2.24; *ĀpŚS* 1.9.13 and *KŚS* 2.7.17 both give the option of a diseased person eating the remaining *piṇḍas* to improve that condition.

the direction associated with the gods. Further, he cleans the rice only once, rather than the usual three times.[91] The authors explain that the Pitṛs passed away only once, *sakṛ́d ú hy èva párāñcaḥ pitáras*, thus the cleaning is to be done only once.[92] These, and other less significant differences, distinguish the ritual as ancestral. More will be said on this distinction shortly.

pitṛyajña: A Summary

The other *śrauta* expression of ancestor worship, the *pitṛyajña*, occurs during the seasonal rites called the *cāturmāsya*. The *pitṛyajña* occurs in the middle of the Sākamedha (*TB* 1.6.8–9), though debate does exist about whether it is an integral part of the seasonal ritual or not.[93] A short myth of the origins of each part of the Sākamedha precedes the description of the *pitryajña*.

The *pitṛyajña* is performed on the second day of the Sākamedha.[94] (Significantly, the sacrificer performs this ritual without his wife.[95]) The sacrificer stands in the south of

[91] Cf. *ŚB* 1.1.4.23, where the rice is cleaning three times since the sacrifice is threefold, *tríḥ phalī́ karoti trivṛddí yajñáḥ*.
[92] This explanation is used three times in this section of the text: *ŚB* 2.4.2.9, for the cleaning of the rice; *ŚB* 2.4.2.13, for the drawing of the line with the sword; and *ŚB* 2.4.2.19, to explain the order of presenting the *piṇḍas*.
[93] Bhide (1979, 94) reviews the differing views expressed in different Brāhmaṇas and by commentators.
[94] The Sākamedha is part of the Cāturmāsya, which occurs four months after the Varuṇapraghāsas on the full moon of Kārtika or Mārgaśīrṣa (Kane 1941, 1100). For greater detail on this ritual see Bhide 1979.
[95] *ĀpŚS* 8.14.1; *KŚS* 5.8.5;
While the wife's participation in the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* is not made explicit, her presence is necessary at least for the end of the ritual, where she eats the middle *piṇḍa*. But at least two Śrautasūtras agree that she should not participate in the *pitṛyajña* of the Sākamedha (*ĀśŚS* is silent on the matter). Āpastamba follows the injunction found in the Brāhmaṇa of his *śākhā*, the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*.

the ritual space, north of the Southern fire, wearing his sacred thread over his right shoulder.[96] He makes offerings to the six types of Pitṛs on pot-shards, *kapālas*, which he has placed on the southern half of the Domestic fire.[97] The Adhvaryu priest grinds the rice while standing north of the fire and facing the south.[98]

He then establishes a *vedi*, a low altar of earth, with its corners facing each of the cardinal directions, to the south of the Southern fire.[99] On the *vedi* he establishes the *āhavanīya* fire, having brought fire from the Southern fire.[100] Next he cuts the grass and—reserving enough for the *prastara*, a later spreading—spreads it around the fires then lays out the necessary implements, as in the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*.[101] The Adhvaryu then 'encloses' the ritual space by drawing a series of lines on the ground.[102]

> ná pátny ánvāste | ná sāṃyājayanti | yát pátny anvā́sīta | yát saṃyājáyeyuḥ pramā́yukā syāt | tásmān nā́nvāste | ná sáṃyājayanti | pátniyai gopīthā́ya | *TB* 1.6.9.10
>
> He does not sit near the wife; they do not sacrifice together. When he sits near the wife or they sacrifice together he is subject to destruction. Therefore he does not sit (near his wife) nor do they sacrifice together, for the protection of the wife.
>
> saṃpraiṣakāle patnīvarjaṃ sampraiṣyati || *ĀpŚS* 8.14.1
>
> At the time of giving instructions, the (Adhvaryu) instructs that the wife is to be excluded.

Kātyāyana too—though drawing on the Vājasaneyī tradition, which has no explicit instruction—makes a similar injunction.

> apatnīkaḥ | *KŚS* 5.8.5
>
> The (sacrificer performs the rite) without his wife.

While it follows from the above-mentioned trend to disassociate certain elements of the sacrificer's life from the death influence of the Pitṛs, however, her exclusion from the *pitṛyajña* juxtaposed to her inclusion in the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* despite similar associations with death in both raises some difficult questions.

96 *TB* 1.6.8.2; *ŚB* 2.6.1.8

97 *TB* 1.6.8.3–5; *ŚB* 2.6.1.7; *KŚS* 5.8.9–15

98 … sá táta évopotthāyóttareṇānvāhāryapácanaṃ dakṣiṇā́ tíṣṭhann ávahanti sakṛ́t phalī́ karoti … *ŚB* 2.6.1.8; The *Kātyāyana Śrautasūtra*, on the other hand, indicated this should happen to the east of the fire. gārhapatyasya purastād avahananapeśaṇe | *KŚS* 5.8.14

99 *TB* 1.6.8.5; *ŚB* 2.6.1.10; *ĀpŚS* 8.13.2

100 ĀśŚS 2.19.1; *KŚS* 5.8.6

101 *ĀpŚS* 8.13.11–14; *KŚS* 5.8.28–29

102 *TB* 1.6.8.5; *ŚB* 2.6.1.12

With the ritual space established, the Adhvaryu switches his sacred thread to his left shoulder and makes two oblations, one to Soma and one to Agni.[103] Having returned his sacred thread to his right shoulder he spreads grass around the *vedi*.[104] After an invitation of the gods and Pitṛs, the priest makes another oblation into the fire. The participants then switch their sacred threads back to the right shoulder and invite the different classes of ancestors to the ritual; each is then made an offering.[105] One last oblation is made to Agni Kavyavāhana, as the deity who will carry the oblations to the Pitṛs.[106] Different texts vary in the details of the offerings and oblations made before the *piṇḍa* offering, but they all have in common a special attention for the switching back and forth of the sacred thread as is appropriate for the divine or ancestral portions of the ritual.

Next[107] the *piṇḍas* are offered to the Pitṛs. While circumambulating the vedi, the Adhvaryu[108] sprinkles water on it for the ancestors to wash, then places three *piṇḍas* on three of the corners of the *vedi*, the father's on the northwest, the grandfather's on the southwest, and the great-grandfather's on the southeast.[109] All the ritual actors move to the north of the ritual space, leaving the Pitṛs to eat.[110] The *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* indicates that they should hold their breath while the Pitṛs partake in the offerings and this accords with the later tradition (*TB* 1.6.9.8). A *mantra* declares that the Pitṛs are satiated and the

[103] *TB* 1.6.9.3; *ŚB* 2.6.1.13
[104] *ŚB* 2.6.1.15
[105] *TB* 1.6.9.4–5; *ŚB* 2.6.1.24–27
[106] *TB* 1.6.9.6; *ŚB* 2.6.1.30–31
[107] In the *ŚB* the remainder of the oblation is smelled by the Hotṛ, the Brahman, and the Āgnīdhra, in turn, but this remainder is not eaten (*ŚB* 2.6.1.33).
[108] *ŚB* offers the option for the sacrificer to offer the *piṇḍas*.
[109] *TB* 1.6.9.7; *ŚB* 2.6.1.34–36; *ĀpŚS* 8.16.6; *KŚS* 5.9.13; *ĀpŚS* 8.16.8 also adds the instruction to wipe the portion of the material used to make the *piṇḍas* that sticks to one's hands on the last corner; this is for the Pitṛs beyond the great-grandfather.
[110] *TB* 1.6.9.7; *ŚB* 2.6.1.37. *TB* specifies that they are to move to the north and that they are to ask for forgiveness (*TB* 1.6.9.8). *ŚB* specifies that they are to switch their sacred cords to the left shoulder and recite verses that praise Indra and Manas (*ŚB* 2.6.1.38–39).

priest washes them again.[111] The rite concludes with a dismissal of the Pitṛs.[112] All the ritual implements are disposed of in the fire and the ritual concludes.

piṇḍapitṛyajña and *pitṛyajña*: A Comparison

A review of the differences between these two rites fosters an understanding of their place in the ritual life of their adherents. My particular concern is understanding the difference between divine and ancestral rites and the impact this has on the performance of ancestor rites. These differences have historical implications, which I use to determine which ritual is the older of the two ancestral rites.

Certain ritual sequences in the *pitṛyajña* differ from those in the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* in significant ways. The *pitṛyajña* exhibits the following significant changes: the switching back and forth of the sacred thread during the ritual, the inclusion of offerings to gods not performed in the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*, and the offering of *piṇḍas* on the *vedi* rather than on the grass. All these differences indicate a common theme: the mixed nature of the *pitṛyajña*, in contrast to the fundamentally Pitṛ-oriented nature of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*.

While the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* requires the sacrificer and priests to wear their sacrificial cords *prācīnāvītin*, over the right shoulder, the *pitṛyajña* requires the participants—Adhvaryu, Brahman, Agnīdhra, Hotṛ, and sacrificer—to repeatedly change back and forth between *prācīnāvītin* and *yajñopavītin*, on the left shoulder and under the right arm, which is appropriate for rituals to the gods. The ritualist moves back and forth between a divinely-oriented mode of worship and an ancestrally-oriented mode of worship, because—as the author of the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* repeatedly informs us—the ritual is for both Pitṛs and gods.[113] Such switches do not occur in the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* as described

[111] *TB* 1.6.9.9; *ŚB* 2.6.1.41
[112] *TB* ends here, but *ŚB* instructs the ritualists to switch their sacred threads again and concludes with a few closing offerings (*ŚB* 2.6.1.43f).
[113] … ubháya hí devā́s ca pitáraś cejyánte … *TB* 1.6.8.2; see also *TB* 1.6.8.5, 1.8.9.1

in the Brāhmaṇas, but do appear in some of the Śrautasūtra descriptions. I suggest this is due to the later mutual influence of the two rites, particularly the distinction made in the *pitṛyajña* between praise offered to deities and to Pitṛs.[114] In the *pitṛyajña*, the Adhvaryu switches his sacred thread when he makes an offering to a deity and switches it back when a ritual action is again to be aimed at the Pitṛs. However, in the *ŚB* (2.4.2.9–11) the Adhvaryu is instructed to place the sacred cord on his right shoulder (Pitṛ orientation) then make two offerings to deities, Soma and Agni. The explanation is clear.

> sá vā́ agnáye ca sómāya ca juhoti | sá yád agnáye juhóti sarvátra hy èvā̀gnír anvā́bhaktó 'tha yát sómāya juhóti pitṛdevátyo vái sómas tásmād agnáye ca sómāya ca juhoti || *ŚB* 2.4.2.12
>
> He sacrifices to Agni and Soma. He sacrifices to Agni because Agni is entitled to a share of everything; and he sacrifices to Soma for Soma is the god of the Pitṛs. Therefore he sacrifices to Agni and Soma.

TB 1.3.10.3 indicates there should be three offerings (*tisrá ā́hutīr juhoti*), the third of which, Sāyaṇa indicates, is made to Yama. The tradition asserts that the deity's place in the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*, arises from a specific relationship with the Pitṛs. Agni shares in all, as the medium through which all oblations reach their supernatural targets. Soma is the deity of the Pitṛs; his association with the ancestors is old already. Perhaps the original reason for the inclusion of these two deities in the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*, derives from the importance of Soma and Agni for the *darśapurṇamāseṣṭi*, the new and full moon rites. Yama's connection with the deceased, on the other hand, is obvious; he is the god of the dead. His inclusion in these rites may have cemented the association of these three with the Pitṛs and further supported their inclusion in the Pitṛ-oriented rite. These three gods receive

[114] Examples of this from the Śrautasūtras are noted above, see fn. 76.

praise from the sacrificer in the Pitṛ-oriented mode of ritual; any potential tension is ameliorated by their association with the Pitṛs.[115]

In the *pitṛayajña*, however, one needs to switch back and forth between divine and ancestral oriented modes of worship, because in that rite one offers oblations to deities who do not have a specific connection with the deceased ancestors, e.g., the offerings at *ŚB* 2.6.1.13 and to Indra at *ŚB* 2.6.1.38. That several oblations are made before the *piṇḍa* offering indicates that this ritual is not centered on feeding the ancestors, as the *ŚB* claims of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* (See Chapter 3). Additionally, in the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* in place of the *sviṣṭakṛt*, a regular part of the ritual, the pot-ladle is placed in the fire.[116] The *sviṣṭakṛ*t offering ordinarily represents the share of Agni in any offering made to a deity (Gonda 1987, 9). With only modified offerings to deities, Soma and Agni as seen above, the normal paradigm of offering Agni a share of the primary oblation is out of place in the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*. This substitution is not made in the *pitṛyajña*, because that rite is, at least in part, a divinely oriented ritual. The mixed nature of the *pitṛyajña* does not require this alteration, as a ritual aimed at the Pitṛs, the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* does. The import of the placing of the pot-ladle in lieu of the *sviṣṭakṛt* eludes me.

Finally, in the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* the *piṇḍas* are offered on the sacred grass strewn south of the southern fire, whereas in the *pitṛyajña* they are offered on three of the four corners of the *vedi*. The *vedi* is central to the normal ritual paradigm, but the re-centering of the offerings made onto the grass in the *piṇḍapitṛyajñ*a to the *vedi* in the *pitṛyajña* suggests that the former ritual was not conceived of as being within the normal ritual paradigm. Shastri agrees, suggesting that the offerings being made on the *vedi* recall the normal

[115] For specific implications of this relationship with respect to the *mantras* employed in these oblations, see below.
[116] *ŚB* 1.7.3.1

paradigm for ritual more clearly (1963, 99). The *piṇḍapitṛyajña* seems to follow a different paradigm, an ancestral paradigm of uncertain origin. These internal differences raise the issue of historical priority.

Arguing for Priority

The aforementioned differences point to the priority of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* and the derivative nature of the *pitṛyajña*. The evidence in support of and counter to this view are of three types: referential, linguistic, and structural/conceptual. In reviewing each, this section addresses the conclusions of the two most significant works on the history of ancestor worship in ancient India, Caland's *Altindischer Ahnencult* and Shastri's *Origin and Development of the Rituals of Ancestor Worship in India*.

In the category of referential evidence Caland makes the following assertion:

> Nun ist es merkwürdig, dass wohl in allen texten und liedersammlungen die zum pitṛyajña gehörigen sprüche sich finden, und in den ältesten brāhmaṇas wohl der pitṛyajña erklärt wird, aber nicht in allen der piṇḍapitṛyajña. So ist in der TS. nur der p.y., I.8.5, behandelt, ebenfalls in der MS., I.10.3.sqq., und wahrscheinlich auch so im Kāṭhakam. Alle die vielen beim pitṛyajña gebrauchten mantras sind in der ṚS. vorhanden, nur einen ausgenommen; von den mantras des piṇḍapitṛyajña dagegen finden sich kaum zwei in dieser saṃhitā. (Caland 1893, 152–153)

As for the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* being absent in earlier Brahmaṇas, he is far from clear to which texts he refers.[117] However, he must not be referring to the *Aitareya Brahmaṇa*, since neither ancestral rite finds mention there. He is correct in so far as the *pitṛyajña* appears in the *Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa*, whereas the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* does not, but this is an argument from silence. Without other supporting evidence, this is a weak argument.

With respect to the choice in verses drawn upon to use in the different rituals, his assertion that use of verses from the *ṚV* in the *pitṛyajña* and the absence of almost any

[117] The *piṇḍapitṛyajña* is described in at least three of the Brāhmaṇas (*JB* 4.4.19–21, *ŚB* 2.4.2, *TB* 1.3.10) and the *pitṛyajña* can be found in (*ŚB* 2.6.1, *TB* 1.6.8, *KB* 5.8–9).

Ṛgvedic verses in the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* indicates the priority of the former rite ignores the multitude of possible causes or rationales for making such a choice. To mention but one possibility, the divine aspect of the *pitṛyajña* may have required the authority inherent in verses from the *ṚV*, whereas the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*, being less in line with the *śrauta* rituals more broadly (see above), did not need, or desire, such associations. In large part, Caland's argument addresses the relative age of the two rites in the *śrauta* tradition alone.[118] Additionally, he ignores the possibility of the ancestral rites originating outside the *śrauta* tradition. While these elements of his argument are weak, Caland does offer more evidence.

Evidence in the Śrautasūtras also supports the view that the *pitṛyajña* is the derivative rite. As seen above, the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* is a shorter, less complicated rite, whereas the *pitṛyajña* is a more involved ritual, even in the Brāhmaṇas. The *pitṛyajña* draws on the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* as the basic paradigm—at least in the mind of the *śrautasūtrakāras*. This is clear from a statement in the *Āpastamba Śrautasūtra*; one portion of the *pitṛyajña* of the Sākamedha follows the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*: *āñjanādi piṇḍapitṛyajñavad ā paṅktyāḥ ĀpŚS* 8.16.13. Other Śrautasūtras also allude to the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* as the model for the offering of *piṇḍas* found in the *pitṛyajña*, though the references are more oblique.[119] While this method of cross-reference, *prakṛti* in Sanskrit, does not give us historical clues as to the relative ages of the rituals, it does indicate a conception in the tradition of which ritual is the more basic expression of the underlying practice, i.e., ancestor worship.

[118] He is most clear that both are extent, in their contemporary form, in the Śrautasūtras.

> Der Piṇḍapitṛyajña muss in seiner jetzt vorliegenden gestalt schon verrichtet gewesen sin in der zeit, da die spätesten der saṃhitās ihre jetzige gestalt bekamen und fixiert wurden. (Caland 1893, 153)

However, this does not speak to the period of the Brāhmaṇas, when these rituals were surely less fixed.

[119] See *ĀśŚS* 2.19.26 and *KŚS* 5.9.13.

Caland also offers linguistic evidence, suggesting that the name indicates that the *piṇḍapitṛayajña* is of more recent origin.

> Auch die namen sprechen dafür: die benennung "Klösseväteropfer" ist allem anschein nach später, und gerade im gegensatz zu einem schon bestehenden "Väteropfer" entstanden; daraus folgt, dass auch der Pitṛyajña ursprünglich ohne klösse war, d.h., dass der cult der drei männlichen ascendenten des opferers nicht dazu gehörte, oder dass in diesem opfer die verehung der pitaras somavantas, barhišadas und agnišvāttās die haupt-, die der drei Ahnen nebensache war. (Caland 1893, 153)

While it may at first blush seem to make sense that *piṇḍa* was added to an older name, the nature of the ritual precludes such an interpretation. In all literature but the Saṃhitās, the *pitṛyajña* employs *piṇḍas*; only speculation supports the existence of an older ancestral rite without *piṇḍas*, especially with no evidence to support this claim. It was certainly not the *pitṛyajñā* of the *Ṛg Veda*; Caland himself recognizes that the *pitṛyajña* of the *ṚV* refers to something else entirely.[120] Additionally, while it is certainly possible that the three immediate ancestors were not an original part of the rite and it was dedicated instead to the 'celestial' Pitṛs,[121] e.g., Barhiṣad Pitṛs and Agniṣvātta Pitṛs, the evidence from the *Ṛg Veda* suggests otherwise. The only occurrence of the term *pitṛyajña* in the *Ṛg Veda* is in the funeral hymn, 10.16, and involves the promotion of the deceased father to the status of Pitṛ.[122] In the light of this evidence, it seems unlikely that the regular performance of the *pitṛyajña* excluded the most recently deceased Pitṛ from

[120] I address the referent of the term *pitṛyajña* in the *ṚV* below.

[121] I borrow the term 'celestial' from the later tradition, where there are clearly two classes of Pitṛs, to distinguish between the two groups: a supernatural class of beings by that name and those ancestors who lived then died to be raised to the status of Pitṛ through ritual. It seems clear that there are two groups even in the older texts, but little can be said beyond that. More work on the historical development of the Pitṛs needs to be done.

[122] I argue this in more detail later in this chapter.

consideration. At worst, the sacrificer would make associations that could hardly be called incidental.[123]

Finally, a structural/conceptual interpretation of the two rituals further suggests that the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* predates the *pitṛyajñ*a. The mythic explanations of the two rituals offer some clue to the purpose of the ritual; a more detailed discussion of these explanations appears in Chapter 3. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* discusses the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* in the context of feeding the ancestors (*ŚB* 2.4.2.1–8), while it places the *pitṛyajña* in the context of the gods' restoration of the Pitṛs through ritual (*ŚB* 2.6.1.1). The *pitṛyajña* also exists as part of the Cāturmāsyas, the seasonal sacrifices, for the Pitṛs are associated with the seasons (*ŚB* 2.6.1.2). The purpose of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*, according to the *ŚB*, is to feed the ancestors (*ŚB* 2.4.2.7–8). On the other hand, the sacrificer performs the *pitṛyajña* not only to feed the ancestors, but also to move his ancestors to a better world, fend off the *asuras*, and absolve himself of whatever sin he may have committed (*ŚB* 2.6.1.3). These differences are more than contextualizing two different rituals in two different mythic cycles. First, the mythic cycle of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* is more basic to the conception of one's relationship to one's ancestors, i.e., feeding them. Second, the

[123] One last bit of data that Caland offers obfuscates the terminological lines.

> In der Vājasaneyisaṃhitā sind die ritualsprüche ze beiden opfern vorhanden; hier stehen sie neben einander; daher kann es nicht auffallen, dass hier der pitṛyajña im gegensatz zum piṇḍapitṛyajña "mahāpiṇḍapitṛyajña" genannt wird (Caland 1893, 153).

While *The Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā* does contain the *mantras* used in both the *pitṛyajña* and the *piṇḍapitṛayajña*, I was unable to find anywhere in the text the term *mahāpiṇḍapitṛyajña* or even the term *mahāpitṛyajña* (Kane (1941, 1101), Eggeling (1882, 420 n. 1), and Shastri (1963, 103) all attest this term for the *pitṛyajña*, all without a citation. I have found only three instances of this term—BŚS 5.11; *HŚS* 5.4; *VŚS* 9.4—though it is significant that is only occurs in a minority of the Śrautasūtras and never in any earlier text to my knowledge.). The presumption that Caland refers to the commentaries also fails to bear fruit. Uvaṭācārya refers only to the *pitryo 'adhyāya* not to the ritual itself and Mahīdhara, who does refer to the ritual, uses the term *pitṛmedha* (Paṇaśīkara 1992, 768–769). (The term *pitṛmedha*, incidentally, is used most frequently to refer to the cremation and funeral.) Even if this term is to be found, it would support the supposition that the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* is the basic, and the newer one is called the *mahā-* in order to praise it over the older model. The prefix *mahā-* is quite frequently a laudatory adjective; examples abound: *mahāyajña*, *mahāyāna*, etc.

pitṛyajña adds aims more frequently associated with ritual in general to the basic aim of the *piṇḍapitṛyaña*; in short, it appears to be a composite rite, with the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* either an older core, or a preexisting rite that influences the former's construction.[124] Unless one presumes a simplification of an older rite—which is possible, though certainly less likely—this suggests that the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* is the older of these two rituals. This view accords with Shastri's view of the differences of the two rituals, "This sacrifice is essentially the same as the Piṇḍa Pitṛ yajna, the only difference being that a very strong garb of sacrifice has been introduced here which makes it very complicated in appearance" (1963, 103–104).

To conclude this attempt to determine on the older of the two Vedic ancestral rites: Caland and Shastri disagree, with Caland offering scant and ambiguous evidence and Shastri offering an opinion with no evidence. Caland says "Daraus schliesse ich, dass als Vedische ceremonie der Pitṛyajña älter ist als der Piṇḍapitṛyajña" (Caland 1893, 153). And Shastri concludes his discussion of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* with: "This form of 'father-worship' seems to be the first step of development in the department of Rituals of ancestor worship" (1963, 99). In brief, the evidence is more suggestive than conclusive, but favors an interpretation of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* as the older of the two, though by how much and the nature of the relationship between these two rituals is obscure. The questions of priority naturally lead one to look for the origins of the ancestor rituals and while this lies outside the scope of my study; the nature of ancestor worship in the *saṃhitā* literature, on the other hand, certainly does not.

124 For the multi-valence of Vedic ritual see Thite 1975, 54 and en passim.

ANCESTOR WORSHIP IN THE *SAṂHITĀ* LITERATURE

This section seeks to establish a connection between the later instances of the ritual and the rare evidence of ancestor worship available to us in the *saṃhitā* literature. One key to understanding ancestor worship in the oldest material are two terms that are central to the later conceptions of ancestor worship. The term *pitṛyajña*, which occurs only once in the *Ṛg Veda*,[125] and the term *svadhā*, later inexorably connected with the *śrāddha*, occur frequently in both the *Ṛg Veda* and *Atharva Veda*. *Pitṛyajña* refers to one part of the funeral and is related to the periodic rites described above in a very circumscribed way. The word *svadhā* is common and has a strong association with ancestral rites in the Brāhmaṇas, but, while occurring more frequently in the *saṃhitā* literature, especially the *Ṛg Veda*, most often has little connection with ancestor worship. The instances traditionally interpreted as associated with the Pitṛs are at best ambiguous and possibly erroneously associated therewith.

pitṛyajña in the *Ṛg Veda*

The word *pitṛyajña* occurs in the *Ṛg Veda* only once, in the hymn to the Funeral Fire, 10.16. In the first two verses, the poet pleads with Agni to convey the deceased to the world of the fathers without consuming him completely.[126] The following verses alternate between verses to aid the deceased in his transition and verses to enjoin Agni to properly effect the transfer of the deceased from this world to the next. Verses 9 through 12 are of a piece and give us small clues about the details of this ritual.

[125] The term also occurs only once in the *AV*, in a version of verse 10:

> yó agníḥ kravyā́t pravivéśa no gṛhám imáṃ páśyann ítaraṃ jātávedasam |
> táṃ harāmi pitṛyajñā́ya dūráṃ sá gharmám indhāṃ paramé sadhásthe || *AV* 12.2.7

[126] máinam egne vídaho mā́bhi śoco mā́sya tvácaṃ cikṣipo mā́ śárīram |
yadā́ śṛtáṃ kṛṇávo jātavedó ‘themenaṃ prá hiṇutāt pitṛ́bhyaḥ || 1
śṛtáṃ yadā́ kárasi jātavedó ‘themenaṃ pári dattāt pitṛ́bhyaḥ |
yadā́ gaccháty ásunītiṃ etā́m atghā devā́nāṃ vaśanī́r bhavāti || *ṚV* 10.16.1–2

kravyā́dam agníṃ prá hiṇomi dūráṃ yamárājño gachatu ripravāháḥ |
iháivā́yám ítaro jātávedā devébhyo havyáṃ vahatu prajānán || 9
yó agníḥ kravyā́t pravivéśa vo gṛhám imáṃ páśyann ítaraṃ jātávedasam |
táṃ harāmi pitṛyajñā́ya deváṃ sá gharmám invāt paramé sadhásthe || 10
yó agníḥ kravyavā́hanaḥ pitṝ́n yákṣad ṛtāvṛ́dhaḥ |
prédu havyā́ni vocati devébhyaś ca pitṛ́bhya ā́ || 11
uśántas tvā ní dhīmahy uśántaḥ sámidhīmahi |
uśánn uśatá ā́ vaha pitṝ́n havíṣe áttave || *ṚV* 10.16.9–12

9 I send forth Agni, the corpse eater,[127] afar: May he, carrying away impurity, go to those who have Yama as a king.
May this one, right here—the other is Jātavedas—knowing (the way) carry the sacrificial food to the gods.
10 Agni, the eater of corpses, who entered your house, seeing the other, Jātavedas,
I carry that god to the *pitṛyajña*; he will send the *gharma* onto the highest meeting place.
11 Agni, who is the carrier of corpses, will sacrifice to the Pitṛs, who grow strong in the truth.
Indeed he will also proclaim the sacrificial foods to the gods and to the Pitṛs.
12 Desiring we lay you down; desiring we kindle you together.
Desiring, fetch the desiring Pitṛs to eat the sacrificial food.

In verse 9 the poet sends Agni to heaven,[128] just as the fire sent the deceased to heaven in the first verse. This does not appear to be a coincidence or even simply a verbal play; the verb *pra-√hi*, convey, dismiss, dispatch, occurs in both verses and resonates with the first verse, a connection a native listener is intended to make in his hearing of the poem. Doniger misreads this as a dismissal of the first fire, the corpse burning fire, and a summoning of the pure fire, the fire that will convey the dead to heaven (Doniger 1981, 47). The fact that the fire is called *krayāt*, eater of flesh, later in the hymn weakens her reading of two fires. I propose an alternative theory; I believe the poet has tied this verse to the first with the repetition of the verb, *pra-√hi*. We know from the first verse that

[127] This term, *kravyā́d*, may best be rendered flesh eater, since *kravya* properly means bloody flesh or carrion, but I here render it corpse because I feel the pair *kravyā́d* and *kravyavā́ana* (from verse 11) make the most sense, in this context at least, referring to a specific dead flesh, that of the deceased. Additionally, the carrier of bloody flesh, does not convey the poet's intent here.
[128] Here, as in verse seven, the poet repeats a verb from the first verse. The verb *pra-√hi* refers here to the fire, whereas in the first verse it referred to the dead person. This type of verbal play seems to be the hallmark of our poet.

Agni is sending the deceased to the Pitṛs, i.e., heaven (*áthem enaṃ pári dattāt pitṛ́bhyaḥ*). Now the poet sends the fire to heaven. The semantic link between these two verses implies that the poet has sent Agni to heaven, *with the dead man*. *Pada* b tells us his destination, the world of those whose king is Yama, i.e., the world of the fathers, heaven.[129] These verses give us some sense of the metaphysical workings of the process of dying,[130] but the next three verses, 10–12, give us a better chance of understanding what is meant by the term *pitṛyajña*.

The fire, Agni, is described here as being one of two, *imam itaram*; but this is merely a poetic play. The sacrificer transforms the fire by bringing it into the house; thus it takes on a different role, though a related one; this merely describes two aspects of Agni's role as a sacrificial fire. Three epithets are used for Agni: Agni Jātavedas, an obscure epithet of Agni,[131] Agni Kravyavāhana, one who carries the corpses, and Agni Kravyāt, the eater of corpses.

Jātavedas appears in this hymn six times: four times it is in the same verse that specifically mentions the deceased joining the Pitṛs or heaven; three of these occur in the same hemi-stich.

[129] If any part of the four funeral hymns, *ṚV* 10.14–18, resemble the later rite of *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa*, the promotion of the deceased to the status of Pitṛ—as Poleman suggests *ṚV* 10.15.1–8 do (1934, 277)—then this hymn does. There is, however, nothing beyond the integration of the deceased into the company of Pitṛs, and that only implied, that suggests that this is anything more than a funeral. It appears, then, that the poets of the *ṚV* imagined no period of transition between the cremation and achieving heaven, a period that is assumed in the later conceptions of ancestor worship, seen most clearly in the *ekoddiṣṭa* and the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa*.

[130] Verses 4–8 also suggest some logistical elements of the ritual, e.g., laying the caul of a cow on the deceased, but these, again, refer to the funeral and not the ancestral rites that are performed for years after the death of a father.

[131] Doniger reads *jātavedas* as Knower of Creatures (Doniger 49). The accent suggests this may not be a *bahuvrīhi* compound, so the meaning is not entirely clear, even if one were to agree to the meanings of these words. While I see no clear reason how this epithet describes Agni, it has been suggested that the term may best be read as a *bahuvrīhi*, despite the uncommon accenture, meaning 'one in whom wealth is born,' referring to the acquisition of one's desires, wealth included, through the ritual fire (Brereton, personal communication). For the moment, I simply leave it as it is and recognize it as an epithet of Agni.

yadā́ śṛtáṃ kṛṇávo jātavedó ‘themenaṃ prá hiṇutāt pitṛ́bhyaḥ || 1cd

When you, Jātavedas, will cook him, then may you convey him to the Pitṛs.

śṛtáṃ yadā́ kárasi jātavedó ‘themenaṃ pári dattāt pitṛ́bhyaḥ || 2ab

When you, Jātavedas, will cook him, them may you surrender him to the Pitṛs.

yā́s te śivās tanvó jātavedas tā́bhir vahainaṃ sukṛ́tāṃ u lokám || 4cd

With these auspicious bodies, Jātavedas, carry him to the broad world of those who have done good.

áva sṛja púnar agne pitṛ́bhyo yás ta ā́hutaś cárati svadhā́bhiḥ |
ā́yurvásāna úpa vetu śéṣaḥ sáṃ gacchatāṃ tanvā́ jātavedaḥ || 5

Release (him) again, Agni, to the Pitṛs. He who is offered to you goes with the svadhās.
Let him follow (his) remainder, clothing himself in a life-span. May he come together with the body, Jātavedas.

In the other two occurrences Jātavedas is contrasted with Kravyāt or said to convey the oblations to the gods. In verse 10 Agni Kravyāt, said to be carried to the *pitṛyajña,* carries the sacrificial food to the highest meeting place. In verse 11 Agni Kravyavāhana is said to sacrifice to the Pitṛs and proclaim/deliver the sacrificial food to both the gods and ancestors. These three aspects together describe the role of Agni in a funeral and verses 10cd–12 culminate in the *pitṛyajña*, the climax of the funeral. That is, Agni has successfully conveyed the deceased to heaven and now the survivors honor him with oblations *as a Pitṛ* in the *pitṛyajña*.

Consider the hymn as a whole. The first eight verses encompass the cremation; the first half of verse 9 sends Agni to heaven with the deceased. The second half of verse 9 to verse 11 mark the ritual offerings: to the gods, to the Pitṛs, then to both. Verse 12 invokes Agni to bring the Pitṛs to the ritual for their offerings. Finally, verses 13 and 14 mark the quenching of the funeral fire. The *pitṛyajña* is merely an offering to the deceased immediately after, or as a part of, the cremation. This may imply that periodic rituals to feed the ancestors were performed, but the only evidence we have is of a ritual as part of

the funeral. Caland supports this reading, recognizing that the term *pitṛyajña* is connected with the cremation.

> In der Ṛksaṃhitā findet sich pitṛyajña, aber noch nicht in der bedeutung, welche das wort später hat: es bedeutet dort (X 16.10) noch nicht Manenopfer oder Ahnenopfer, sondern ist synonym mit dem, was gewöhnlich pitṛmedha genannt wird, d.h. die bestattungsfeier, welche z.b. AGS IV.1.sqq. und im Kauçikasūtra 80 sqq. gemalt wird. (Caland 1893, 152)

I must disagree, however, with the specific connection that he draws, for the *pitṛyajña*, as I have shown, is clearly part of the cremation ritual, not synonymous with it.

Kane asserts that the three funeral hymns, *ṚV* 10.15–18,[132] are employed in rites immediately after death and are aimed at making the ancient Pitṛs favorably disposed to the recently departed (Kane *HOD* IV, 201). While this may certainly play some role, its funerary context suggests something more relevant. The sacrificer praises the deceased as an ancestor, a Pitṛ; his promotion from corpse to ancestor seems more basic to the intent of this ritual. Unlike *pitṛyajña*, the term, *svadhā* occurs quite frequently in the *saṃhitā* literature.

Ritual Implications of *svadhā*

From the time of the Brāhmaṇas *svadhā* refers to the *mantra* employed in ancestor worship; it occurs many times in both the *ṚV* and the *AV* and illumines the ritual of ancestor worship in those texts. The term has little connection to ancestor worship in the *Ṛg Veda*, and that only in a funerary context, but it occurs in the *Atharva Veda* more regularly with an association to ancestor worship, in both funerary and other contexts.

132 I am not sure why Kane does not include 10.14, which clearly refers to the dead. Further, while the main import of the hymn is a metaphysical journey for the deceased from the world of the living to the world of the ancestors, there are some hints about the ritual involved, e.g., verses 13f which accompany the offering of oblations to Yama.

svadhā *in the Brāhmaṇas*

In the classical ancestral rites found in the Gṛhyasūtras the term *svadhā* is central to the ritual and comes to refer to the entire sacrificial act of making an offering to the Pitṛs.[133] In the Brāhmaṇas, however, it does not refer to the offering itself, it is a *mantra* that occurs in both the *pitṛyajña* and *piṇḍapitṛyajña*. Its usage in the *pitṛyajña* is identical in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* and the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*. Immediately prior to the invitation of and primary oblations to the various classes of Pitṛs and before the offering of *piṇḍas*, the priests call for *svadhā*.

> utā́śrāvayanty óṃ svadhéty ástu svadhéti pratyāśrā́vaṇaṃ svadhā́ náma íti vaṣaṭkāraḥ || 24 *ŚB* 2.6.1.24
>
> And then the (Adhvaryu) does the *āśrāvaṇa*, "Oṃ *svadhā*." The (Āgnīdhra) responds "So be it. *svadhā*!" Performing the *vaṣaṭ* is "*svadhā* homage."
>
> ā́ svadhéty ā́śrāvayati | ástu svadhéti pratyā́śrāvayati | svadhā́ náma íti vā́ṣaṭ karoti | … *TB* 1.6.9.5
>
> He calls out "*svadhā*!" He responds "So be it. *svadhā*!" He performs the Vaṣaṭ, saying, "*svadhā*, homage!"

The *TB*, further, is explicit about this formula's association with the ancestral rites.

> svadhākāró hí pitṛṇā́m | … *TB* 1.6.9.5
>
> For performing the *svadhā* is for the Pitṛs.

Its occurrence at the beginning of the section that deals with the Pitṛs directly suggests it is an invocation of the Pitṛs—not an invitation because an invitation follows this formula, but an opening benediction—an invocation specifically associated with the Pitṛs that distinguishes the rest of the ritual from the divine aspects of the ritual. The *mantra* for the invocation of the gods is *svāhā*.

[133] See the subsequent section on the Gṛhyasūtras for more details.

Unfortunately, the clean distinction found between the *mantra* for the gods, *svāhā*, and the *mantra* for the Pitṛs, *svadhā*, is less consistent in the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*. The *TB* prescribes the use *svadhā* for the formulas addressed to Soma and Agni Kavyavāhana in the oblations to these two deities.

> sómāya pitṛ́pītāya svadhā́ náma íty āha | … *TB* 1.3.10.2
> He says, "To Soma, the draught of the Pitṛs, *svadhā*, homage!"

> agnáye kavyavā́hanāya svadhā́ náma íty āha | … *TB* 1.3.10.3
> He says, "To Agni Kavyavāhana, *svadhā*, homage!"

The *ŚB* on the other hand, employs the *mantra* used in the rites to the gods, *svāhā*, for the same ritual moment.

> sá juhoti | agnáye kavyavā́hanāya svā́hā sómāya pitṛmáte svā́héty … *ŚB* 2.4.2.13
> He offers, saying "To Agni Kavyavāhana, *svāhā*! To Soma Pitṛmat, *svāhā*!"

The reason for the difference seems to lie in proper orientation of the sacrificer toward the object of worship, i.e., divine or ancestral orientation. While the *pitṛyajña* makes clear the transitions from divine to ancestral moments in the ritual, the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* is an ancestral rite throughout; changing of the sacred thread—which is a mark of the *pitṛyajña*m, but absent in the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*—marks this difference. In the *TB*, Soma is invoked in his connection to the Pitṛs, specifically as their drink, and the poet offers praise to Agni as the conveyor of the oblations to the Pitṛs. As noted in the description of the ritual above, these two gods appear in this ancestral ritual in an aspect that emphasizes their association with the ancestors, thus the authors choose to use the *mantra* appropriate for an ancestral rite. The *ŚB* chooses to emphasize their divinity, addressing them with *svāhā*, the *mantra* reserved for the divine. These passages, referring to the same ritual moment, evidence a certain flexibility in the application of these *mantras*; their use was not as restricted as in the later tradition, at least not in the context of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*.

svadhā *in the* saṃhitā *literature*

The semantic range of the term *svadhā* has not narrowed in the *saṃhitā* literature; it still expresses its basic etymological meaning, independence, most often, but its association with the ancestral rites does occur in these texts. This section accomplishes three things: 1. demonstrate the most common connotation of the word *svadhā* in the *saṃhitā* literature—and show that this meaning survives in the Brāhmaṇas as well—2. evaluate the connotation of this term in the funerary context to show that, while the distinction between *svāhā* and *svadhā* is attested, *svadhā* most frequently carries its more general meaning; and 3. use this information to speculate on what light this evidence sheds on ancestor worship in the *saṃhitā* literature. In short, I show that the evidence of the *Ṛg Veda* is too limited to reveal much and the evidence of the *Atharva Veda* is ambiguous, though in both texts *svadhā* probably refers to some complex of rituals that share a great deal with the ancestral rites found in the Brāhmaṇas.

svadhā*: Its More General Connotation*

The term *svadhā* occurs in the Saṃhitās most frequently in its most common sense of power or will, implying the independence of the actor; quite frequently associated with a god or goddess. For example,

> ásūta pṛ́śnir mahaté ráṇāya tveṣám ayā́sāṃ marútām ánīkam |
> té sapsarā́so 'janayantā́bhvamā́dit svadhā́m iṣirā́ṃ páryapaśayan || *ṚV* 1.168.9
>
> Pṛśni gave birth to the turbulent face of the unruly Maruts for great joy/battle. They, in shared delight, begat the formless (cloud) mass. Just after that they surveyed their vigorous self-power. (Brereton and Jamison)

In this verse the Maruts perceive their inherent power, the power by which they create the clouds. In another example, this power is contrasted with *māyā*.

> tváṃ māyā́bhir ápa māyíno 'dhamaḥ svadhā́bhir yé ádhi śúptāv ájuhvata |
> tváṃ píproḥ nṛmaṇaḥ prā́rujaḥ púraḥ prá ṛjíśvānaṃ dasyuhátyeṣv āvitha | *ṚV* 1.51.5

With your craft you blew away the crafty, who willfully poured (offerings) on their shoulders.
You, mindful of men, broke Pipru's strongholds and aided Ṛjiśvan in the slaying of dasyus. (Brereton and Jamison)

While *svadhā* ordinarily shows one's independence in a positive light, this example exhibits a counter example. Indra, the preeminent example of the independent deity, defeats those who willfully (*svadhā́bhir*) violate the sacrifice, with his craft, *māyā*, a term generally possessed of negative connotations. The irony in this verse nicely highlights the contrast of these two 'power words'.

Frequently, the word *svadhā* appears in the instrumental case with the verb √*mad*, to rejoice, to exult, to be exhilarated, for example:

yád indrāgnī úditā́ sū́ryasya mádhye diváḥ svadháyā mādáyethe |
átaḥ pári vr̥ṣaṇāvā́ hí yātám áthā sómasya pibataṃ sutásya || *ṚV* 1.108.12

When, Indra and Fire, at the rising of the sun in the middle of the heaven you bring yourselves to elation by your own power,
from there, bulls—yes! drive here. Then drink of the pressed Soma (Brereton and Jamison)

dáivyā hótārā prathamā́ ny ṙ̥ñje saptà pr̥kṣā́saḥ svadháyā madanti |
r̥táṃ śáṃsanta r̥tám ít tá āhur ánu vratáṃ vratapā́ dī́dhyānāḥ || *ṚV* 3.4.7

I direct down the divine hotar-priests, the two that are first. The seven fortified, become exhilarated by their own will.
Reciting the truth, they speak only the truth, as they, the protectors of commands, reflect upon their commands. (Brereton and Jamison)

In the *Ṛg Veda*, over half of the occurrences of *svadhā* or some derivative, e.g., *śvadhāvat*, refer to a deity; among those Indra is most frequent.[134] Almost as common the term appears with a slightly broader sense with the same implications, i.e., by one's own

[134] The term, or its derivatives, appears 103 times in the *ṚV* and seventy-four refer to deities; of these at least twenty-five refer to Indra. These numbers are not surprising as Indra is the most frequently eulogized god in the *Ṛg Veda*.

power, referring to a broader range of actors. Similarly, in the *Atharva Veda*, the term most frequently has one of these two senses.[135]

Throughout the tradition and in scholarly works, the term *svadhā* has anachronistically been interpreted to be a reference to the ancestor rites, assuming the same connotations that are found in the much later literature. In fact, interpreters have been so blinded by the later semantic import of this term some have missed the older meaning just discussed when it was encountered in the Brāhmaṇas.

When the ritualist is instructed to recite a *mantra* to repel demons that may covet the offerings, the term *svadhā* is used in the sense more common in the *saṃhitā* literature.

> sá nídadhāti | yé rūpā́ṇi pratimuñcámānā ásurāḥ sántaḥ svadháyā cáranti parāpúro nipúro yé bháranty agníṣ ṭā́ṃ lokā́t práṇudāty asmā́d íty agnír hí rákṣasām apahantā tásmād eváṃ nídadhāti | *ŚB* 2.4.2.15
>
> He lays (the firebrand) down (saying) "Whatever asuras go about loose by their own will (*svadhayā*) in various shapes, great bodied or small bodied, may Agni expel them from this world." Agni is the destroyer of rakṣ*asas*, therefore he lays it down.

In this case the author employs the word simply to indicate that the demons have the power to roam about, but at least one commentary reads this as "(attracted) by the svadhā

[135] The term, or its derivatives, occurs in the *AV* seventy-eight times; thirty-two of these have either the sense of power or independence, thirteen of which are employed by specific deities. Interestingly, only once in the *AV*, and never in the *ṚV*, the term refers to food, a trait common in its later usage, see my section on Gṛhyasūtras, p. 129f.

> bhū́myāṃ devébhyo dadati yajñáṃ havyám áraṃkṛtam |
> bhū́myāṃ manuṣyā jī́vanti svdháyānnena mártyāḥ |
> sā́ no bhū́miḥ prāṇám áyur dadhātu jarádaṣṭiṃ mā pṛthivī́ kṛṇotu || *AV* 12.1.22
>
> On the earth he gives to the gods sacrifice, a suitably prepared oblation.
> On the earth mortal men live by the *svadhā*, food.
> May she (the earth) assign us life's breath and a lifespan; may the Earth make me long-lived.

It is more interesting still that the *svadhā* is said to be the food of mortal men, *manuṣyā martyāḥ*. This contrasts with *ŚB* 2.4.2 which divides up the social order along the lines of food using different categories: *devas*, gods; Pitṛs, ancestors; *manuṣya*, men; *paśu*, beasts; and asuras, demons (for lack of a better word). It was suggested to me that this may refer to all those who have been mortal, men and Pitṛs, in contrast to the gods of the first verse (Brereton private communication). Either way, we have different conception of categorizing beings here.

(offerings to the fathers)" (Eggeling 1882, 365 n1). That the translator had to add in the attraction emphasizes the strained nature of this interpretation. At the beginning of the section on the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* is another example of this more common usage.

In the mythic preamble to the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* the author lists the foods for each of the classes of beings: gods, ancestors, men, beasts, and asuras.

> … tā́n abravīd yajñó vó 'nnam amṛtatvám̐ vá ū́rgvaḥ sū́ryo vo jyótir íti | 1 … tā́n abravīn māsí māsi vó 'śanaṃ svadhā́ vo manojavó vaś candrámā vo jyótir íti | 2 … tā́n abravīt sāyám prātarvó 'śanam prajā́ vo mṛtyúr vo 'gnír vo jyótir íti | 3 *ŚB* 2.4.2.1–3[136]
>
> 1 To them (the gods) he said "Sacrifice is your food, (therefore) immortality is yours; strength is yours. The sun is your light." … 2 To them (the Pitṛs) he said "Monthly is your eating, (therefore) *svadhā* yours and quickness of mind is yours. The moon is your light." … 3 To them (men) he said "In the evening and the morning is your eating, (therefore) offspring is yours and mortality is yours. The fire (Agni) is your light." [137]

The author continues with animals and asuras, though he breaks from the nice parallel construction that marks the first three beings. The pattern is clear: 1. food, 2. defining characteristics, and 3. light. The primary aim of this section is to define the food and, dependent upon the mode of eating, character of the beings. Gods eat at the sacrifice, ancestors at the monthly ancestral rites, and men twice during the day. The gods are associated with the sun as the Pitṛs are with the moon, and men with their performance of sacrifice, through fire. The second item on each list defines the primary attribute of the being; gods are immortal and men mortal. The Pitṛs, then, are defined by *svadhā*.[138] I

[136] Some editions (e.g., Weber 1964) read *manojavī́* instead of *manojavó*. Since this is an adjective and makes a difficult passage make little sense, I think this reading is simply mistaken.

[137] I follow Sāyaṇa in establishing a causal link between the first element and the middle two elements:

> yajño vo 'nnam iti | he devāḥ vaḥ yuṣmākam yajñaḥ annam ato yuṣmākam eva amṛtatvam urk balaṃ ca vaḥ yuṣmākam eva sūryaḥ eva vaḥ yuṣmākam jyotiḥ iti |

[138] A similar association is made in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* when the author praises singing the Sāman.

suggest this is equally connected with the meaning just discussed as it is with the *svadhā* as employed in the ancestral rites. The fact that the term *svadhā* appears nowhere else in the *ŚB* treatment of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* is also suggestive; it seems that the clear-cut association of the *svadhā* with ancestral rites has not yet developed in the *ŚB*. In later texts one cannot use the word *svadhā* without invoking some connection to the ancestral rites; that is not so in the *ŚB*.

I do not, by this, suggest that there is no association of the word *svadhā* with ancestor worship. The Brāhmaṇas outline ancestral rites; clearly they were aware of ancestor worship. And the term *svadhā* is employed in those rites; clearly the term has a strong association with the ancestors. My point is different. The term is not exclusively associated with ancestral rites as it is in the later tradition, the Gṛhyasūtras for example. In the *saṃhitā* literature the association of *svadhā* with the Pitṛs does occur, but in a more limited manner.

> amṛtatvaṃ devedhya āgāyānītya āgāyet | svadhāṃ pitṛbhya āśāṃ manuṣyebhyas tṛṇodakaṃ … āgāyānīty etāni mansā dhyāyann apramattaḥ stuvīta || *CU* 2.22.2
>
> When a person sings to obtain something, he should do so with the thought, 'Let me obtain immortality for the gods by my singing.' Likewise, he should be careful to keep the following thoughts in his mind as he sings the songs of praise: 'Let me obtain by my singing food offerings for the ancestors, … (Olivelle)

While the parallels between the characteristic of each entity as expressed in these two passages is important, more significant here is the association of the *svadhā* with the ancestral rites and the possibility of interpreting the word both as a reference to the rites and in the more broad sense of independence. A comparison of this passage with the *ŚB* passage just quoted may suggest the latter meaning is more pronounced.

Praśna Upaniṣad uses the term *svadhā* in a similarly ambiguous manner:

> devānām asi vahnitamaḥ pitṛṇāṃ prathamā svadhā |
> ṛṣīṇāṃ caritaṃ satyam atharvāṅgirasām asi || *PU* 2.8
>
> You are the best bearer of offerings to the gods.
> You are the first oblation to the fathers.
> You are the truth that the seers practiced,
> the Atharvans and the Aṅgirasas. (Olivelle)

Like the *CU* passage, this verse may be read in two ways: to refer to the ancestral oblations or to the independence of the Pitṛs, perhaps to refer to both.

svadhā *in Funerary Contexts within the* Ṛg Veda

Far less frequently than in its more general meaning, *svadhā* is employed in the context of the deceased and the Pitṛs. Of the 103 occurrences in the *ṚV* eight appear in the funeral hymns, 10.14–17, and all have be traditionally interpreted as referring to the oblations made in the ancestral rites. As is usual in the *Ṛg Veda*, these verses are ambiguous and, I argue, in all but one *svadhā* can be read to refer to the independence of the actor, rather than as an ancestral oblation. Some examples are in order.[139]

> préhi préhi pathíbhiḥ pūrvyébhir yátrā naḥ pū́rve pitáraḥ pareyúḥ |
> ubhā́ rā́jānā svadháyā mádantā yamáṃ paśyāsi váruṇaṃ ca devám || *ṚV* 10.14.7
>
> Go forth along those ancient paths where our ancient fathers went on.
> You will see the two kings, Yama and the god Varuṇa, finding exhilaration by their own power (*svadhayā*).

The gods Yama and Varuṇa revel in heaven, they are not directly involved in the promotion of the deceased to the next world, thus nothing suggests they participate in the offerings to the Pitṛs. Further, Varuṇa never occurs in the later rituals in which *svadhā* is addressed to a deity, his association with the dead is tenuous, unlike Yama and Agni who are intimately associated with the Pitṛs, as seen above.

In the next hymn the word *svadhā* describes the class of Pitṛs known as the Barhiṣads and their enjoyment of Soma.

> ā́haṃ pitṝ́n suvidátrān avitsi nápātaṃ ca vikrámaṇaṃ ca víṣṇoḥ |
> barhiṣádo yé svadháyā sutásya bhájanta pitvás tá ihā́gamiṣṭhāḥ || *ṚV* 10.15.3
>
> I found the benevolent Pitṛs, and a son, and the step of Viṣṇu.
> The Barhiṣad (Pitṛs) who enjoy the pressed (Soma) by their own power, they come quickly for the drink.

[139] The passages in the funeral context that use the term *svadhā* are:10.14.3; 10.14.7; 10.15.3; 10.15.12–14; 10.16.5; 10.17.8. I discuss only a few of these.

The root √*bhaj* takes as it object the genitive of *suta*, pressed—a common term for referring to Soma. The word *svadhayā* is acting adverbially, as seen before. They have the power to partake in Soma, as Indra does repeatedly.

In the same hymn two other classes of Pitṛs are said to revel in heaven.

> yé agnidagdhā́ yé ánagnidagdhā mádhye diváḥ svadháyā mādáyante |
> tébhiḥ svarā́ḷ ásunītim etā́ṃ yathā́vaśáṃ tanváṃ kalpayasva || *ṚV* 10.15.14
>
> Those burned by fire and those unburned by fire, who are exhilarated by their own power in the midst of heaven,
> May you (Agni), along with them, create a body and this heaven, O resplendent one, according to your desire.

Comparing this verse with *ṚV* 1.108.12, quoted above, highlights the common association of *svadhā* and √*mad*. They occur together ten times in the *ṚV*, more than half are outside a funeral context. These few examples show that the term *svadhā*, even in a funeral context, does not refer to the ritual of ancestor worship, but carries its more common implication of independence. In short the gods and the Pitṛs are free to follow their will.[140] In fact the deceased is said to have this power shortly after Agni cremates him.

In 10.16, Agni is enjoined to release the dead man, and the dead man is said to move under his own power.

> áva sṛja púnar agne pitṛ́bhyo yás ta ā́hutaś cárati svadhā́bhiḥ |
> ā́yur vásāna úpa vetu śéṣaḥ sáṃ gachatān tanvā́ jātavedaḥ || *ṚV* 10.16.5
>
> Release (him) again, Agni, to the Pitṛs, he who is offered by you goes by his own power.
> Let him follow his remainder, clothing himself in life; may he come together with the body, Jātavedas.

[140] Consider also *ṚV* 10.17.8, in which Sarasvatī is said to enjoy herself with the Pitṛs.

> sárasvati yā́ sarátham yayā́tha svadhā́bhir devi pitṛ́bhir mádantī |
> āsád yāsmín barhíṣi mādayasvānamīvā́ íṣa ā́ dhehyasmé || *ṚV* 10.17.8

With a new body, presumably with the transformation to Pitṛ complete, he is able to make his way to heaven by his own power, as the gods and Pitṛs do. The conjunction of *svadhā* and the verb √*car* also occurs in the *ŚB* referring to the asuras who threaten the ritual. The term *svadhā* describes the ability of supernatural beings to follow their own will.

This connotation even extends to the use of the word *svadhā* in the funerary context where one would most expect the term *svadhā* to unambiguously refer to the verbal formula of the ancestral rites. Only one of the eight instances of *svadhā* in the *ṚV* implies the specific connection of the word *svadhā* with an ancestral rite as we have seen in the Brāhmaṇas. In the first of the funeral hymns, 10.14, there is a verse with strong ritual implications.

> mā́talī kavyáir yamó áṅgirobhir bṛ́haspátir ṛ́kvabhir vāvṛdhānáḥ |
> yā́ṃ śca devā́ vāvṛdhúr yé ca devā́n svā́hānyé svadháyānyé madanti | *ṚV* 10.14.3
>
> Matali by the Kavya, Yama by the Aṅgirases, and Bṛhaspati by the ṛkvans become strengthened; whom the gods strengthen and who strengthen the gods; some are exhilarated by the *svāhā* and others by the *svadhā*.

The poet draws correspondences between deities and classes of priests, between the gods and those who give them material support—the sacrificer who supports the gods through ritual—and between *svāhā* and *svadhā*. Despite this recognition of a distinction, this hymn gives us little to understand the details of the distinction; another funeral hymn aids in clarifying this point.

In *ṚV* 10.16, the poet invokes Agni in two of his roles: the fire who carries the oblations to the gods, *devébhyo havyáṃ vahatu* (*ṚV* 10.16.9), and the fire employed "for the purpose of *pitṛyajña*" *pitṛyajñā́ya* (*ṚV* 10.16.10). The next verse makes a distinction between oblations to the gods and the Pitṛs (*préd u havyā́ni vocati devébhyaś ca pitṛ́bhya ā́*). This poet knew of a formalized ancestor worship involving oblations to the Pitṛs,

called the *pitṛyajña*. The location of this term, in the hymn to the funeral fire, and the extremely rare use of the term *svadhā* in a context that makes explicit its association with ancestor worship in the *ṚV* suggest that the *pitṛyajña* referred originally to the funeral or some part thereof.[141] The use of *svadhā* in this connection, however, is more frequent in the *Atharva Veda*.

svadhā *in the* Atharva Veda

That the *svadhā* as referent to ancestral rites is limited in the *ṚV* to the funeral hymns is not surprising, but the term *svadhā* finds a wider application in the *AV*. The *Ṛg Veda* is primary concerned with the Soma rites and most of the material that addresses other rites are found in the tenth book. The *Atharva Veda*, on the other hand, was complied with a more far-reaching scope in mind. Thus we find the term *svadhā* referring to ancestor worship in other contexts as well.

svadhā *in Funerary Contexts within the* Atharva Veda

Though a review of verses in the *Atharva Veda* that demonstrate the more common meaning of *svadhā* would certainly be interesting,[142] its application within the funerary context and occurrences that demonstrate an association with the ancestral rites is more fruitful for my aims. In the funerary hymns of the *Atharva Veda* the term is employed

[141] Poleman has tried to identify a correspondence between the order of *ṚV* 10.14–18 and the ritual process of a funeral and subsequent burial (1934). His article is little more than supposition and glosses over verses which clearly disrupt his nice sequencing as well as making wildly anachronistic assumptions about the reordering of elements of the ritual.

[142] Of particular interest are 10.10.6,17–18 and 12.5.3, which both view the cow as a vessel of *svadhā*. The latter even places *svadhā* in a list with *śraddhā*. Also 13.6, in which a list of conspicuous pairs are enumerated in a hymn to Rudra—*tapas* and *kīrti*; *yaśas* and *ambha*; *nabha* and *brahmaṇavarvas*; *anna* and *annādya*; *bhūta* and *bhavya*; *śraddhā* and *ruci*; and *svarga* and *svadhā*—could prove to be illuminated if a larger context for these pairs can be identified.

much in the same way as in the *ṚV*. Though this should not be surprising as much is borrowed from that text.[143]

A handful of the verses discussed in their Ṛg-vedic avatar appear again in the *Atharva Veda* funeral hymns; for example *AV* 18.1.45 is *ṚV* 10.15.3 and *AV* 18.1.54 is *ṚV* 10.14.7.[144] In total six verses that use *svadhā* are drawn from the *Ṛg Veda* and their new context does not suggest a reinterpretation of these terms.[145] However, some of those verses which do not occur in the *ṚV* do raise interesting possibilities. Of the thirty-six occurrences of the word *svadhā* in the funeral hymns of the *Atharva Veda* six are duplicates,[146] ten use *svadhā* in its more common sense, and seventeen are actual *mantras*, which offer little in content to interpret. The remaining four, however, do.

143 For a detailed comparison of exactly which verses are borrowed from which hymns of the *Ṛg Veda*, Whitney's synoptic statements at the beginning of each of the hymn in Book 18 are invaluable (Joshi 2000, 132–221).

144 *AV* 18.1.54 is a slightly modified version of *ṚV* 10.14.7, substituting *yena* for *yatrā* and *rajānau svadhayā madantau* for *rajānā svadhayā madantā*. Another, more interesting modification occurs in *AV* 18.2.10, a modification of *ṚV* 10.6.5, consider them together:

> áva sṛja púnar agne pitṛ́bhyo yás ta ā́hutaś cárati svadhā́bhiḥ |
> ā́yurvásāna úpa vetu śéṣaḥ sáṃ gachatān tanvā́ jātavedaḥ || *ṚV* 10.16.5
>
> Release (him) again, Agni, to the Pitṛs, he who is offered by you goes by his own power.
> Let him follow his remainder, clothing himself in life; may he come together with the body, Jātavedas.
>
> áva sṛja púnar agne pitṛ́bhyo yás ta ā́hutaś cárati svadhā́vān |
> ā́yurvásāna úpa yātu śéṣaḥ sáṃ gachatāṃ tanvā́ suvárcāḥ || *AV* 18.2.10
>
> Release (him) again, Agni, to the Pitṛs, he who is a *svadhā*-endowed oblation to you.
> Let him follow his remainder, clothing himself in life; may he, endowed with splendor, come together with the body.

This seems neither to contradict my understanding the term *svadhā*, nor greatly alter the meaning of this verse, but it would be interesting to further explore similar shifts in terminology in verses taken from the *ṚV* and used in the *AV*, though that lays beyond the scope of my inquiry here.
One other verse goes through a different type of transformation in the process of being transferred. *AV* 18.2.35 corresponds to *ṚV* 10.15.14ab and 13cd.

145 Other examples of verses that are in a funerary context but are used in the more general meaning are: 1118.1.43; 18.3.8,42; 18.4.39. The refrain found in 18.3.30–35, all employing *svadhā* in an obscure way, defy logic and interpretation. Without any implication available, I relegate these, with some hesitation, to the group of occurrences that express the idea of power or will.

146 18.4.25–26 and 18.4.42–43 repeat 18.3.68–69. 18.4.47 duplicates 18.1.43. 18.4.65 repeats 18.3.42, which is in turn identical to *ṚV* 10.15.12.

The first appears to describe offerings made during the funeral.

apūpā́pihitān kumbhā́n yā́ṃs te devā́ ádhārayan |
té te santu svadhā́vanto mádhumanto ghr̥taścútaḥ || 68
yás te dhānā́ anukirā́mi tilámiśrā́ḥ svadhā́vatīḥ |
tā́s te santu vibhvī́ḥ prabhvī́s tā́s te yamó rā́jā́nu manyatām || *AV* 8.3.68–69

68 May those cake-covered pots that the gods hold for you be possessed of *svadhā*, rich in honey, and flowing with ghee.
69 May that grain/barley, mixed with sesame and accompanied by *svadhā* that I scatter along be increasing and abundant. May Yama honor/approve them for you.

Since this is the only occurrence of the word *svadhā* as an attribute of an offering, it is difficult to determine its exact referent, however, the association of *svadhā* with the oblations made in the funeral does establish a connection of this word with the offerings made to the deceased. In this context it would be hard to argue that it is indicative of another ritual.[147]

The next verse clearly indicates the direct connection between *svadhā* and oblations to the Pitr̥s.

abhí tvórṇomi pr̥thivyā́ mātúr vástreṇa bhadráyā |
jīvéṣu bhádraṃ tán máyi svadhā́ pitŕ̥ṣu sā́ tváyi || *AV* 18.2.52

I auspiciously cover/surround you with the garment of mother Earth
That auspiciously in me among the living, that *svadhā* in you among the Pitr̥s.[148]

The first hemistich, probably referring to the internment of the relics of cremation, reinforces the funerary context. The second half of the verse seems to reinforce, for both the deceased and the survivors, that the former are dead and the latter living. In this they assert that the *svadhā* is for the Pitr̥s alone.

The final verse from the funeral hymns reinforces the common notion that the rituals one performs in this life will build a heaven that awaits one's death.

[147] Though some do this very thing (Joshi 2000, 217).
[148] The second hemistich is vaguely reminiscent of *TB* 1.3.10.9, which is the end of the section on the *piṇḍapitr̥yajña*, though it is unclear to me whether they are connected in any way.

asaṃbādhé pṛthivyā́ uráu loké dhīyasva |
svadhā́ yā́ś cakṛṣé jī́van tás te santu madhuścútaḥ || *AV* 18.2.20

May you be destined for the un-crowded wide world of the earth.
May those *svadhās* that you performed while living be flowing with honey.

The odd thing about this verse, however, is that it seems to imply that the *svadhās*, i.e., the ancestral rites, that one performs while living will be awaiting that very person. This verse, then, seems to describe the ritual storehouse that one establishes in heaven through sacrifice (see Chapter 3) with the term *svadhā*. I found no other instance that used the word in this way; it certainly has a certain logic,[149] but it is unique.

In another verse, from a non-funerary context, *svadhā* relates closely to the funeral fire. It occurs in a hymn to two aspects of the ritual fire: Kravyād, the corpse-eater, and Gārhapatya, the household fire. This distinction also occurs in the hymn to Agni in the *Ṛg Veda*, 10.16, and, in fact, the *AV* hymn borrows from that very hymn as well as from *ṚV* 10.18, another funerary hymn.[150] This verse also uses the term *svadhā* in a way that seems to imply it is an oblation.

vyā́karomi havíṣāham etáu táu bráhmaṇā vy ahám̐ kalpayāmi |
svadhā́ṃ pitṛ́bhyo ajárāṃ kṛṇómi dīrghéṇā́yuṣā sám imā́nt sṛjāmi || *AV* 12.2.32

I separate these two from the oblation; I fashion these two with a *brahman*.
I make the *svadhā* undecaying for the Pitṛs; I join it (*svadhā*) with a long lifespan.

This conception of the oblation seems to be a secondary implication from its use in the *mantras*, and, I believe, could be the beginnings of the semantic shift whose end is seen in the later literature that considers *svadhā* synonymous with the oblations in and rituals

149 In fact, the notion that ancestral rites secure a place in heaven for both the performer and the ancestor is common in the Purāṇas and, though less commonly, occurs in the Mahābhārata, but I have not seen this in earlier literature.

150 With slight modifications, *AV* 12.2.7=*ṚV* 10.16.10; *AV* 12.2.8=*ṚV* 10.16.9; *AV* 12.2.21=*ṚV* 10.18.1; *AV* 12.2.22=*ṚV* 10.18.3; *AV* 12.2.3=*ṚV* 10.18.4; *AV* 12.2.24=*ṚV* 10.18.6; *AV* 12.2.30ab=*ṚV* 10.18.2ab; and *AV* 12.2.31=*ṚV* 10.18.7.

of ancestor worship. Unlike in the *Ṛg Veda*, *svadhā* also occurs with this expanded semantic range occurs outside the funerary context in the *Atharva Veda*.

svadhā *in Other Contexts within the* Atharva Veda

There are a handful of verses that employ the term *svadhā* in a way that, to varying degrees, implies its association with the Pitṛs and, at least once, as a specific part of an ancestral rite. In a hymn to Suparṇa, we find an ambiguous, though suggestive, use of the term.

> śyenó nṛcákṣā divyáḥ suparṇāḥ sahásrapác chatáyonir vayodhā́ḥ |
> sá nó ní yacchād vásu yát párābhṛtam asmā́kam astu pitṛ́ṣu svadhā́vat || *AV* 7.41.2
>
> The man-beholding falcon, the divine eagle, with 1000 feet, 100 wombs, vigorous
> May he bestow on us that good which is hidden; let that which is possessed of *svadhā* among the Pitṛs be ours.

While the referent of the final *pada* is unclear, several factors combine to suggest that this refers to the ritual or even to the oblations in the ritual. Obviously, the mention of the Pitṛs, particularly to something belonging to the Pitṛs, suggests their oblations, though as mentioned earlier, in the discussion of *svadhā's* more general meaning, this may be a characteristic of being a Pitṛ and have little to do with ancestor worship. Additionally, the term *nṛcakṣa*, man beholding, is used in *ṚV* 10.14.11 to refer to the Yama's dogs who watch over the path the dead take to heaven.[151] The most I can assert is a resonance in the mind of the hearer. Other verses are less ambiguous.

One hymn to Virāj, *AV* 8.10, describes her engaging the Pitṛs.

> sódakrāmat sā́ pitṝ́n ā́gacchat tā́ṃ pitára úpāhvayanta svádha éhī́ti | 5
> tásyā yamó rā́jā vatsá ā́sīd rajatapātrā́ṃ pā́tram | 6
> tā́m ántako mārtyavó 'dhok tā́ṃ svadhā́m evā́dhok | 7
> tā́ṃ svadhā́ṃ pitára úpa jīvanty upajīvanī́yo bhavati yá eváṃ véda | *AV* 8.10.5–8

[151] I do not wish to overstate the significance of this term, as a perusal of the *ṚV* shows it applies to a great variety of gods.

5 She ascended; she went to the Pitṛs. The Pitṛs called her down, "*svadhā*, come!"
6 King Yama was her calf; the vessel of silver was her vessel.
7 Antaka Mārtyava milked her; he milked *svadhā* from her.
8 The Pitṛs subsist on that *svadhā*; who knows thus becomes one to be subsisted upon.

Virāj calls to the Pitṛs as the priests do in the later ritual and she is milked of her *svadhā*. To this point the term may carry only its more general sense of power, but the final hemistich makes clear the relationship of the Pitṛs to the *svadhā*: they subsist upon the *svadhā*. In this passage the term *svadhā* seems to almost take on the much later meaning, referring to the oblation itself and probably calls to mind the Brāhmaṇa passage that describes the ancestral rites as primarily concerned with feeding the Pitṛs. But I suggest that it refers to the ritual more generally; it is emblematic of the ancestor worship and synecdoche for the entire ancestral rite. This is most clear in the next passage.

In another hymn to the cow we find a verse that extols three virtuous acts—ancestor worship, sacrifice to the gods, and the gifting of a cow—acts that hold the religious imagination in India for millennia.

svadhākāréṇa pitṛ́bhyo yajñéṇa devatābhyaḥ |
dánena rājanyò vaśā́yā mātúr héḍaṃ ná gacchati || *AV* 12.4.32

By the *svadhā*-call for the Pitṛs; by sacrifice for the gods,
By gifting a cow, the kingly (man) does not receive the ire of the mother.

The parallel construction of the verse makes clear that the *svadhākāra* is put on par with sacrifice and is aimed at the Pitṛs.[152] It seems clear that by the time of the *Atharva Veda*

[152] Another verse suggests the same, though not as clearly.

there was a common conception of ancestor worship of some kind. Unfortunately, with the few clues that liturgical texts such as the *Ṛg Veda* and the *Atharva Veda* offer us, we cannot know the exact referent.

In short, the term *svadhā* occupies a rather ambiguous place in the Vedic literature that we have available. It is clear that it had two distinct meanings: independence and as a word employed in a ritual setting. Few of the passages discussed can be clearly determined to have only one of these meanings; most can be interpreted as meaning either, largely due to the limited nature of their contexts and the ambiguous nature of the use of the term. It is also possible, perhaps probably, that many of the ambiguous passages are intentionally ambiguous; that is; the author intended that both senses of the word would be brought to mind. The further forward in time one reads, the more likely this is, since the authors of the Brāhmaṇas clearly were aware of both uses and employed both. The intentions of authors of the late Ṛg vedic passages and many passages from the *Atharva Veda*, however, are more obscure; many of the most interesting passages make as much sense read with one meaning as with the other. More work needs to be done to understand the complicated history and usage of this important term.

sá yát pitṝ́n ánu vyácalad yamó rā́jā bhūtvā́nuvyácalat svadhākārám annādáṃ kṛtvā́ || 13
svadhākāréṇānnādénā́nnam atti yá eváṃ véda || *AV* 15.14.13–14

13 When he followed the Pitṛs, having become king Yama, he followed, having made the *svadhā*-call the eater-of-food.

14 The one who knows thus, eats food with the *svadhā*-call as eater-of-food.

This verse appears as part of sequence that follows the above pattern with different directions (toward the eastern quarter, toward the southern quarter, toward the western quarter, toward the northern quarter, toward the fixed quarter, toward cattle, toward the Pitṛ, toward men, toward the upward quarter, toward the gods, toward progeny, toward the intermediate directions), different deities (the Maruts, Indra, Vrātya, Soma, Viṣṇu, Rudra, Yama, Agni, Bṛhaspati, Īśāna, Prajāpati, *brahman*), and different 'eaters-of-food' (*manas*, *balamat*, *apas*, *āhuti*, *viraj*, *oṣadhī*, *svadhā*, *svāhā*, *vaṣaṭ*, *manyu*, *prāṇa*, *brahman*). It seems that the list of sacrificial terminology suggests that *svadhā* is another ritual term, though it is far from certain.

Ancestor Worship in the *saṃhitā* literature: Some Conclusions and Speculation

My review of the terminology and few clues about the ritual suggest that the conclusions, in fact details, that others, e.g., Doniger and Poleman, have drawn from the evidence in the *ṚV* are greatly exaggerated. This section draws together the conclusions about ancestor worship based on the study of the terms *pitṛayajña* and *svadhā*. I also speculate on the nature of the ritual referred to in the *saṃhitā* literature and its relationship to the more fully developed ritual described in the Brāhmaṇas.

In the *Ṛg Veda* and *Atharva Veda* the term *svadhā* most frequently refers to the independence of the person praised or described. This usage even occurs in the funerary context in both texts where the tradition and scholarly interpreters have generally read the term as, due to the context, necessarily referring to the ritual, or the oblations therein, of ancestor worship. In the *ṚV* the term appears as an unambiguous referent to some sort of ancestor rite once, 10.14.3, where a distinction is made between *svāhā* and *svadhā*, though the use of this dichotomy, in fact of the verse itself, is a bit disconnected from the context of the rest of the hymn. Thus there is room for interpretation; I leave this to others.

In the *Atharva Veda*, the *svadhā* most often carries the more general meaning as well, though there is a greater frequency of instances where the term refers, in varying degrees of ambiguity, to the ritual or the oblation. Whether due to the nature of the texts—e.g., the *ṚV* being primarily Soma text—or due to an increased association of the word *svadhā* with the ritual and oblations to the Pitṛs, the term does carry that latter connotation more frequently in the *AV*. The fact that the term is also used in this way outside the funerary context may indicate that it has come to have a greater import in the general ritual scheme of the Vedic world. Unfortunately, while the *svāhā/svadhā* dichotomy appears in the *AV* context as well, the sum of the occurrences of the term

svadhā in the *AV* adds little detail to our understanding of the rituals of ancestor worship in the *saṃhitā* period.

I suggest that the ritual implied by the term *pitṛyajña* in the *ṚV* refers to the brief offerings made to the deceased upon his promotion to heaven. That the poets fail to mention details of the ritual follows the dictates of the genre. The poetic praise of the divine does not require a detailed explanation of the ritual, in fact it probably prohibits such expressions, but the poets give us clues as to the nature of the ritual.

It is through ritual that one wins heaven and through ritual that the material concerns are secured there.

> sáṃ gachasva pitṛ́bhiḥ sáṃ yaméneṣṭāpūrténa paramé vyòman |
> hitvā́ yávadyáṃ púnar ástam éhi sáṃ gachasva tanúvā suvárcāḥ || *ṚV* 10.14.8
>
> Meet with the Fathers, with Yama, in the highest heaven with what is sacrificed and given.
> Having abandoned imperfections, come home again. Come together with a body, full of radiance.

The ritualist earns the next world through the performance of sacrifice and, as in the 10.16, a new body awaits him.[153] The later *śrāddha* ritual is explicitly about building a new body for the next world; while this connection is tenuous, the resemblance of the details in another hymn more clearly call to mind the later *śrāddha* ritual.

Hymn 10.15 invokes several types of Pitṛs by name, inviting them to come forward and protect the sacrificer (*nò avantu pitáro hávеṣu*) (*ṚV* 10.15.1).[154] They are invited to eat and enjoy Soma (*ṚV* 10.15.3) and are repeatedly asked for protection and the poet reinforces the offering, this time referring to the food as "dear treasures that are placed on kuśa grass," as the *piṇḍas* in later rituals are (*úpahūtāḥ pitáraḥ ... barhiṣyéṣu nidhíṣu*

[153] I discuss this at greater length in chapter 4.

[154] This may have prompted Caland to suggest that the rituals of ancestor worship began as rites to these Pitṛs, not the direct descendents of the sacrificer (1893, 153 quoted above).

priyéṣu) (*ṚV* 10.15.5). In verse 11 the Pitṛs are urged to eat the offerings made on the kuśa grass, "Eat the pure offerings on the sacred kuśa grass" (*attā́ havī́ṃṣi práyatāni barhíṣy*) (*ṚV* 10.15.11). The reward sought is made clear in the same verse: "and then bestow wealth together with sons" (*áthā rayíṃ sárvavīraṃ dadhātana*). The final verse in this hymn connects the body sought in the *ṚV* 10.14 with the ritual referred to here.

> tébhiḥ svarā́ḷ ásunītim etā́ṃ yathāvaśáṃ tanváṃ kalpayasva || *ṚV* 10.15.14
> May you (Agni), along with them, create a body and this heaven, O resplendent one, according to your desire.

The ritual, of which this hymn was a component, aims to convey the deceased to heaven, complete with a body. While unlike the monthly *śrāddha* of the later tradition, this looks very similar to the *ekoddiṣṭa* and *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa śrāddha* of the later period. As these rites are more closely related to the funeral, and are even added to funeral rites in some Gṛhyasūtras, than the monthly rites makes such comparisons natural. Nevertheless, it seems most likely that the transfer of the deceased to heaven was a function of the cremation rather than a separate ritual as it is in the later tradition.

Coupled with my reading of the term *pitṛyajña* above, this reading of the goal of the ritual makes the ritual referent in the *ṚV* clear: these offerings that are a part of the funeral/cremation in the *ṛg-vedic* period. The *pitṛyajña* is an offering to the deceased upon their promotion to the status of Pitṛ. One might draw the conclusion from this that there were indeed periodic offerings to the dead, otherwise a single oblation to the recently deceased may seem odd, but this is highly speculative and there is no evidence either way from which to draw a definitive conclusion. The adoption of the funerary language by the later tradition—seen above in my discussion of the *svadhā* in the Brāhmaṇas and to be seen in my subsequent section on the Gṛhyasūtras—is evidence of the influence of this ritual cycle on the later tradition. One could speculate that the ancestral rites that are described in the Brāhmaṇas existed in the *saṃhitā* period, as others

have done, but it seems safer to simply assert that the funerary offerings, language, and rituals find a place in the later tradition, and leave speculation on the nature of those older rites to others.[155]

ANCESTOR WORSHIP IN THE GṚHYASŪTRAS

The Gṛhyasūtras mark a significant moment in the history of ancestor worship in India. They record two threads in the development of ancestor worship ritual: one preserves, in a modified form, the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* of the Śrautasūtras and the other describes domestic ancestor worship, rituals much different from the public Vedic ritual of the Brāhmaṇas and Śrautasūtras. The former ritual occurs as one part of the *anvaṣṭakya* on the second day of the *aṣṭakā* ceremony, described below, and is described by reference to the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* of the *śrauta* ritual, though the ritual differs in significant ways from the *śrauta piṇḍapitṛyajña*. The latter ritual, most often called *śrāddha*, looks remarkably similar to the rite that appears in the Purāṇas and that finds expression in contemporary Hinduism. Some of the aspects of these two rituals that distinguish it from the *śrauta* rites become hallmarks of the later ritual tradition. The magnitude of the differences is all the more important because the time frame between the Śrautasūtras and the Gṛhyasūtras is so short.

But, these differences did not arise in the brief time between the Śrautasūtras and the Gṛhyasūtras. The tradition of domestic rites, as the *śrauta* tradition does, dates back to a time far earlier than its textualization. References to domestic rituals in the Brāhmaṇas attest to a lively domestic ritual life (Gonda 1977b, 547; Oldenberg 1967, xv–xxii),

[155] The references to ancestor worship in the Upaniṣads add nothing the historical development of the ritual. *CU* 2.22.2 and *PU* 2.8 are discussed in fn. 138, in connection to the term *svadhā*. *KaU* 3.17 is discussed below in fn. 204, in connection to the *śrāddha*. The remainder (*BU* 3.8.9; *CU* 7.1.2,4; 7.2.1; 7.7.1; *TU* 1.11.2) evidence merely an awareness of the ancestral rites, and frequently occur in a narrative as a list that demonstrates a character’s knowledge of ritual, or completeness of proper behavior.

though Oldenberg successfully demonstrates that no sustained literature on the household ritual predated the Gṛhyasūtras (Oldenberg 1967, xviii). The domestic rites grew and developed during the same time frame as the *śrauta* rites. Two traditions of ancestor worship thrived within the same larger tradition, but these two traditions are not combined in the Gṛhyasūtras; they are simply recorded, though some amount of cross pollination does seem evident, especially in the alterations to the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*. But it is the *śrāddha* that becomes the paradigm of ancestor worship for the subsequent Hindu tradition.

This section describes the rituals as they appear in the Gṛhyasūtras and addresses the developments that find expression in the Gṛhyasūṭras. Both rituals follow the same basic paradigm that stretches back to the Brāhmaṇas, but also bear the mark of significant innovation. Two significant developments are visible in both rituals: the introduction of meat offerings and the elimination of the cadre of ritual priests. Two other innovations appear only in the *śrāddha* ritual: the introduction of a Brahmin who stands in for the deceased father and the specialization of the rite into several types. These changes radically alter the conception of ancestor worship and impact the tradition of ancestor worship in significant ways.

The *piṇḍapitṛyajña*: Ancestor Worship in the *anvaṣṭakya*

Understanding these changes between the *śrauta* and *gṛhya* models of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* necessitates a description of the ritual as seen in the Gṛhyasūtras. The *anvaṣṭakya* occurs on the second day of the Aṣṭakā ritual; *Gobhila Gṛhyasūtra* records the particulars of the ritual in great detail (*GGS* 4.2–3), so Gobhila's account is used to illustrate the rite.

***Summary of the* anvaṣṭakya *in the* Gobhila Gṛhyasūtra**

The householder apportions the ritual space to the south-east of the house, with its long side in that direction and an entrance to the west.[156] To the north the sacrificer draws the *lakṣaṇa*, five lines drawn on the ground to prepare it for the establishment of the fire, and carries the fire there.[157] To the west of the fire he places the mortar and husks[158] and threshes[159] one handful of the rice. He then prepares the meat offering by cutting a lump of meat from the thigh used on the previous day of the Aṣṭakā to be mixed in with the *piṇḍa*.[160] On the same fire he cooks up an oblation of rice grains and an oblation of meat.[161] He then pours an oblation of butter on them and removes them from the fire toward the south.[162]

In the southern part of the sacrificial space he digs three furrows[163] and carries the fire to a *lakṣaṇa* he has made to the east of the eastern-most furrow.[164] He then strews *darbha* grass—that he has cut off in one stroke—around the fire and over the furrows.[165] Having spread out a layer of *kuśa* grass, with it tips pointed to the south, to the west of the furrows, he places on it a mat and the sacrificial instruments: the two pots in which

[156] dakṣiṇapūrve 'ṣṭamadeśe parivārayanti | 3
tathāyatam | 4
tathāṃukhaiḥ kṛtyam | 5
caturavarārdhyān prakramān | 6
paścād upasaṃcāraḥ | *7 GGS* 4.2.3–7

[157] uttarārdhe parivṛtasya lakṣaṇaṃ kṛtvāgniṃ praṇayanti | *GGS* 4.2.8

[158] paścād agner ulūkhalaṃ dṛṃhayitvā sakṛtsaṃgṛhtaṃ vrhimuṣṭiṃ avahanti savyottarābhyāṃ pāṇibhyāṃ | *GGS* 4.2.9

[159] sakṛd eva suphalīkṛtān kurvīta | *GGS* 4.2.11

[160] athā 'muṣmāc ca sakthno māṃsapeśīm avakṛtkya navāyāṃ sūnāyāṃ aṇuśaś chedayet | *GGS* 4.2.12–13

[161] tasminn evāgnau śrapayaty odanacaruṃ ca māṃsacaruṃ ca pṛthaṅ mekṣaṇābhyāṃ prasvayam udāyuvan | *GGS* 4.2.14

[162] śṛtāv abhighārya dakṣiṇo 'dvāsya na pratyabhighārayet | *GGS* 4.2.15

[163] dakṣiṇārdhe parivṛtasya tisraḥ karṣūḥ khanayet pūrvopakramāḥ | *GGS* 4.2.16

[164] pūrvasyāḥ karṣvāḥ purastāl lakṣaṇaṃ kṛtvāgniṃ praṇayanti | 18
apareṇa karṣūḥ paryāhṛtya lakṣaṇe nidadhyāt | *GGS* 4.2.18–19

[165] sakṛdācchinnaṃ darbamuṣṭiṃ stṛṇoti | 20
karṣūś ca | *GGS* 4.2.20–21

the oblations have been cooked, the two ladles, one vessel, one *darvī* spoon, and water.[166] The sacrificer's wife places a stone on the *barhis* and grinds fragrant powder and collyrium; with these she anoints three blades of *darbha* grass.[167] He also brings sesame oil and piece of linen from the fringe of his garment.[168]

He invites an odd number of Brahmins who are without blame and sits them, facing north, on a seat of *darbha* grass he has made for them.[169] Having offered water and sesamum to the Brahmins he says his father's name and recites, "This sesamum water is for you, for those who follow you, and those whom you follow. To you *svadhā*!"[170] Then he washes himself by touching water and repeats the offering for his grandfather and great-grandfather.[171] This whole cycle is repeated with an offering of perfume.[172]

Before offering the oblations into the fire, he indicates his actions to the Brahmins, thereby asking permission, saying, "I shall offer in the fire."[173] When they assent with, "Offer it," he cuts off a portion from each oblation, offering the first with "*svāhā* to Soma Pitṛmat!" and the second with "*svāhā* to Agni Kavyavāhana!"[174]

[166] paścāt karṣūṇāṃ svastaram āstārayet | 23
dakṣiṇāgraiḥ kuśaiḥ | 23
dakṣiṇāpravaṇaṃ | 25
vṛṣīṃ co 'padadhyāt | 26
tatrā 'smā āharanti ekaikaśaḥ svyaṃ bāhum anu | 27
carusthālyau mekṣaṇe kaṃsaṃ darvīm udakam iti | *GGS* 4.2.23–28

[167] patnī barhiṣi śilāṃ nidhāya sthagaraṃ pinaṣṭi | 29
tasyāṃ caivāñjanaṃ nighṛṣya tisro darbhapiñjūlīr añjati avyantarāḥ | *GGS* 4.2.29–30

[168] tailaṃ co 'pakalpayet | 31
kṣaoumadaśāṃ ca | *GGS* 4.2.31–32

[169] śucau deśe brāhmaṇān anindyān ayugmān udaṅmukhān upaveśya | 33
darbhān pradāya | *GGS* 4.2.33–34

[170] udakapūrvaṃ tilodakaṃ dadāti pitur nāma gṛhītvā 'sāv etat te tilodakaṃ ye cātra tvānu yāṃś ca tvam anu tasmai te svadhe 'ti | *GGS* 4.2.35

[171] apa upaspṛśyai 'vam eve 'tarayoḥ | *GGS* 4.2.36

[172] tathā gandhān | *GGS*4.2.37

[173] agnau kariṣyāmīty āmantraṇaṃ hoṣyataḥ | *GGS* 4.2.38

[174] kurv ity ukte kaṃse carū samavadāya mekṣaṇeno 'paghātaṃ juhuyāt svāhā somāya pitṛmata iti pūrvāṃ svāhāgnaye kavyavāhanāya ity uttarām | *GGS* 4.2.39

At this point the sacrificer switches his sacred thread to his right shoulder, indicating a shift to Pitṛ-oriented offerings.[175] Additionally, we are told the householder is to proceed silently, though the use of *mantras* continues.[176] He then takes a blade of *darbha* grass with his left hand a draws a line from north to south with a *mantra* to expel the asuras.[177] Again with his left hand, he takes up a firebrand and places it on the south side of the furrows, with a *mantra* to drive away *rakṣases*.[178]

He then invites the Pitṛs to the sacrificial space with a *mantra*, "Come here Pitṛs who are worthy of Soma!"[179] Having moved the water vessels near the furrows, he takes them up in turn with his left hand and pours from right to left on the *darbha* grass in each furrow with the name of each ancestor, "Wash yourself, those who follow you, and those whom you follow. To you *svadhā*!"[180] washing his hands between each ancestor.

Now, with the left hand again, he uses the *darvī* spoon to cut off one-third of the mixture of oblations and make a *piṇḍa*; that he places in the eastern most furrow with his father's name and "This *piṇda* is for you, those who follow you, and those whom you follow. To you *svadhā*!"[181] He again washes himself and repeats the *piṇḍa* offerings in

It seems safe to assume that, as in the Brāhmaṇas, the difference between using *svāhā* and *svadhā* in the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* falls along *śākhā* lines. The difficultly in verifying this from texts alone, is that few Gṛhyasūtras record the *mantras* used in the rites; most texts, in fact, refer to the *śrauta* expression of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* for the details of this ritual.

[175] Here we see the influence of the *pitṛyajña* on the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* ritual.

[176] ata ūrdhvaṃ prācīnāvītinā vāgyatena kṛtyam | *GGS* 4.3.1

[177] savyena pāṇinā darbhapiñjūlīṃ gṛhītvā dakṣiṇāgrāṃ lekhāṃ ullikhed apahatā asurā iti | *GGS* 4.3.2

[178] savyenaiva pāṇino 'lmukaṃ gṛhītvā dakṣiṇārdhe karṣūṇāṃ nidadhyād ye rūpāṇi pratimuñcamānā iti | *GGS* 4.3.3

[179] atha pitṝn āvāhayaty eta pitaraḥ somyāsa iti | *GGS* 4.3.4

[180] atho 'dapātrān karṣūṣu nidadhyāt | 5 savyenaiva pāṇino 'dapātraṃ gṛhītvā 'vasalavi pūrvasyāṃ karṣvāṃ darbheṣu ninayet pitur nāma gṛhītvā 'sāv avanenikṣva ye cātra tvānu yāṃś ca tvam anu tasmai te svadhe 'ti | 6
apa upaspṛśyai 'vam eve 'tarayaoḥ | *GGS* 4.3.5–7

[181] savyenaiva pāṇinā darvīṃ gṛhītvā sannītāt tṛtīyamātram avadāyaāvasalavi pūrvasyāṃ karṣvāṃ darcheṣu nidadhyāt pitur nāma gṛhītvā 'sāv eṣa te piṇḍo ye cātra tvā 'nu yāṃś ca tvam anu tasmai te svadhe 'ti | *GGS* 4.2.8

each subsequent furrow to each subsequent ancestor.[182] After putting the *piṇḍas* down on the grass and encouraging them to enjoy themselves, he turns away and holds his breath. Before releasing his breath he turns back and says, "The Pitṛs are very gladdened! Each has acted the bull to their own share!"[183] He then takes up each of the anointed *darbha* blade with his left hand and places it on each of the *piṇḍas* in turn, dedicating the collyrium on it to each of this ancestors.[184] He repeats this cycle, offering oil and perfume in turn.

Next he asks for forgiveness with a series of *mantras* that offers reverence to the Pitṛs and invokes several emotions/aspects: *jīva*, life; *śuṣmā*, vigor; *ghora*, terror; *rasa*, sap; *svadhā*, independence; and *manya*, rage.[185] Looking at his home he says, "Give us houses, O Pitṛs!"[186] Looking at the *piṇḍas* he says, "May we give you an abode!"[187] He

[182] apa upaspṛśyaivam eve 'tarayoḥ | *GGS* 4.3.9
If he does not know their names he offers with *mantras* to the Pitṛs dwelling in the earth, the air, and heaven, respectively. yadi nāmāni na vidyāt svadhā pitṛbhyaḥ pṛthivīśadbhyaḥ iti prathamaṃ piṇḍaṃ nidadhyāt svadhā pitṛbhyo 'ntarīkṣasadbhya iti dvitīyaṃ svadhā pitṛbhyo diviṣadbhya iti tṛtītyam | *GGS* 4.3.10

[183] nidhāya japati atra pitaro mādayadhvaṃ yathābhāgam āvṛśāyadhvam iti | 11
apaparyāvṛtya pruo 'cchavādād abhiparyāvartamāno japed amīmadanta pitaro yathābhāgam āvṛṣāyiṣate 'ti | *GGS* 4.3.13 (*ŚB* 2.6.1.40)

[184] svayenaiva pāṇinā darchapiñjūlīṃ gṛhītvāvasalavi pūrvasyāṃ karṣvāṃ piṇḍe nidadhyāt pitur nāme gṛhītvā 'sāv etat ta āñjanaṃ ye cātra tvānu yāṃś ca tvam anu tasmai te svadhe 'ti | 13
apa upaspṛśyaivam eve'tarayoḥ | *GGS* 4.3.13–14

[185] This sequence is quite similar to that used in the *piṇḍapitṛyajñā* as expressed at *TB* 1.3.10.8.

> athā nihnute | 17
> pūrvasyāṃ karṣvāṃ dakṣiṇottānau pāṇī kṛtvā namo vaḥ pitaro jīvāya namo vaḥ pitaraḥ śuṣmāyeti | 18
> madhyamāyāṃ savyottānau namo vaḥ pitaro ghorāya namo vaḥ pitaro rasāyeti | 19
> uttamāyāṃ dakṣiṇottānau namo vaḥ pitaraḥ svadhāyai namo vaḥ pitaro manyava iti | 20
> athāñjalikṛto japati namo vaḥ pitaraḥ pitaro namo va iti | *GGS* 4.3.17–21
>
> 17 Then he asks for forgiveness;
> 18 With his right hand turned upward in the eastern furrow, (he says) "Reverence to you, O Pitṛs, for life. Reverence to you, O Pitṛs, for vigor."
> 19 With his left hand turned upward in the middle furrow, (he says) "Reverence to you, O Pitṛs, for terror. Reverence to you, O Pitṛs, for sap."
> 20 With his right hand turned upward in the last furrow, (he says) "Reverence to you, O Pitṛs, for *svadhā*. Reverence to you, O Pitṛs, for rage.
> 21 With his hands joined together, (he says) "Reverence to you, O Pitṛs. Reverence to you."

[186] gṛhān avekṣate gṛhān naḥ pitaro datteti | *GGS* 4.3.22

then takes a thread and places it on each *piṇḍa* in each furrow, from right to left, with the name of each ancestor with the *mantra* "This garment is yours, of those who follow you, and of those whom you follow. To you *svadhā*!" washing himself with water between each ancestor.[188]

Taking up the water vessel again with his left hand, he sprinkles around the *piṇḍas* in a counter-clockwise manner.[189] If his wife desires a son, then he has her eat the middle *piṇḍa*. If not, the Brahmins who receive the remnants consume it.[190] He then extinguishes the fire-brand and cleans the sacrificial vessels by sprinkling them with water.[191] The *piṇḍas* can be disposed of in four ways: throw them in water, throw them in the fire, feed them to a Brahmin, or feed them to a cow.[192]

piṇḍpitṛyajña *in Other Gṛhyasūtras*

This detailed description, however, is not common in the Gṛhyasūtras; the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* received uneven treatment in the different Gṛhyasūtras, for example, Śāṅkhāyana's account of the *anvaṣṭakya* amounts to one *sūtra*.

> śvo anvaṣṭakyam piṇḍapitṛyajñāvṛtā | *ŚGS* 3.13.7
> On the following day the Anvaṣṭakya, following the method of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*.

[187] piṇḍān avekṣate sado vaḥ pitaro deṣmeti | *GGS* 4.3.23
[188] savyenaiva pāṇinā sūtratantuṃ gṛhītvāvasalavi pūrvasyāṃ karṣvāṃ piṇḍe nidadhyāt pitur nāme gṛhītvbā 'sāv etat te vāso ye cātra tvānu yāṃś ca tvam anu tasmai te svadheti | 24
apa upaspṛśyaivam evetarayoḥ | *GGS* 4.3.24–25
[189] savyenaiva pāṇino 'dapātraṃ gṛhītvāvasalavi piṇḍān pariṣiñced ūrjaṃ vahantīr iti | *GGS* 4.3.26
[190] madhyamaṃ piṇḍaṃ patnī putrakāmā prāśnīyād ādhatta pitaro garbham iti | 27
yo vā teṣāṃ brāhmaṇānāṃ ucchiṣṭabhāk syāt | *GGS* 4.3.27–28
[191] abhūn no dūto haviṣo jātavedā ity ulmukam adbhir abhyukṣya | 29
dvandaṃ pātrāṇi prakṣālya pratyatihāṛyayet | *GGS* 4.3.29–30
[192] apsu piṇḍān sādayet | 31
praṇīte vāgnau | 32
brāhmaṇaṃ vā bhojayet | 33
gave vā dadyāt | *GGS* 31–34

The author only pauses briefly at the end of his brief description of the *aṣṭakā* to mention the *anvaṣṭakya*, merely stating that it follows the procedure of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*. He need not mention the details; they would be known to anyone who knew the Śrautasūtra.

Pāraskara also describes the *anvaṣṭakya*—using the term *anvaṣṭakā* instead—in one *sūtra*.

> śvo 'nvaṣṭakāsu sarvāsāṃ pārśvasakthisavyābhyāṃ parivṛte piṇḍapitṛyajñavat || *PGS* 3.3.10
>
> On the next day, on the Ānvaṣṭakā, of each, (he sacrifices) in the enclosure with the left rib and thigh, as in the *piṇḍapitṛyajña.*

Pāraskara gives us more detail, indicating the enclosure created in the ritual and the inclusion of meat offerings, but he too feels no need to review the procedure. He does, however, emend two *sūtras* indicating that the sacrificer should also make offerings to his female ancestors with liquor, water, collyrium, unguents, and garlands and granting the option of offering to pupils and teachers who have no children.[193]

Āśvalāyana's account represents a slightly more complex description of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*.

> apare dyur anvaṣṭakyam | 1
> tasyaiva māṃsasya prakalpya dakṣiṇāpravaṇe 'gnim upasamādhāya pariśrityouttarataḥ pariśridasya dvāram kṛtvā samūlam barhis trir apasalair avidhūnvan paristīrya havīṃṣy āsādayed odanam kṛsaram pāyasam dadhi manthān madhumanthāṃś ca | 2
> piṇḍapitṛyajñakalpena | 3
> hutvā madhumanthavarjam pitṛbhyo dadyāt | 4
> strībhyaś ca surā ca ''cāmam ity adhikam | 5
> karṣūṣv eke dvayoḥ ṣaṭsu vā | 6

[193] Collyrium and unguent, at least, appear elsewhere as offering to the Pitṛs.

> strībhyaś copasecanaṃ ca karṣūṣu surayā tarpaṇena cāñjanānulepanaṃ srajaś ca || 11
> ācāryāyāntevāsibhyaś cānapatyebhya icchan ||*PGS* 3.3.11–12
>
> 11 And sprinkling in the furrows for the ladies, with the liquor, with the *tarpaṇa*, collyrium, unguent, and garlands.
> 12 (If he) desires, (he gives) to a teacher or his pupil who are childless.

pūrvāsu pitṛbhyo dadyāt | 7
aparāsu strībhyaḥ | 8
etena māghyāvarṣam proṣṭhapadyā aparapakṣe | *ĀśGS* 2.5.1–9

1 On the following day (i.e., the second Aṣṭaka day), the Anvaṣṭakya (is performed).
2 He should prepare (a portion) of that meat, kindle the fire on (ground) inclined toward the south, enclose it (with sticks), make an entrance on the north side of the enclosure, strew the *barhis*, with its roots, three time around counter clockwise, without shaking it, he should seat the *havises*: boiled rice, sesamum and rice, milk porridge, coagulated milk, *mantha*, and honey *mantha*.
3 (It should be performed) according to the procedure of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*.
4 Having made the offerings, with the exception of the honey *mantha*, he should give (*piṇḍas*) to the Pitṛs.
5 And to the female (ancestors), he adds liquor and rice water.
6 Some (do so) in the furrows, either two or six.
7 In the (furrows) to the east he should give (*piṇḍas*) to the Pitṛs.
8 In the (furrows) to the west he should give to the female (ancestors).
9 By this (one knows) the Māghyāvarṣa (rite done) on the dark half of the moon following the Proṣṭhapadyā full moon.

Āśvalāyana reviews the procedure in the unusually long second *sūtra*. His description, however short, accords in the basics with Gobhila's account. Like Gobhila, Āśvalāyana too offers options for offerings to be given to one's female ancestors.[194] He then states an option with regard to the placement of the *piṇḍas*. Some, he says, offer the *piṇḍas* in the furrows dug as part of the ritual (6–8), indicating that the placement of the *piṇḍas* in the furrows, as seen in *GGS*, in Āśvalāyana's mind, is an alternative. He refers to the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* as the basic paradigm, i.e., offering on grass as in the Śrautasūtras. In short, Āśvalāyana's description of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* accords with the older *śrauta* model on many counts, but one dramatic change we see in Āśvalāyana's account is the inclusion of a meat offering.

[194] strībhyaś ca surā ca ācāmam ity adhikam || *ĀśGS* 2.5.5

piṇḍapitṛyajña*: Old and New*

This leads to a discussion of the development of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*, its conservative nature, and the significant innovations that appear in the Gṛhyasūtras. The above summary of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* of the Gṛhyasūtras reveals two things: the ritual is heavily indebted to the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* of the Śrautasūtras, often simply referring to those texts for details, and a few significant differences are evident. This section has three aims: 1. to point out basic similarities that indicate that the *gṛhya piṇḍapitṛyajña* is modeled on, if not merely a reference to, the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* of the *śrauta* tradition; and 2. to describe and contextualize the significant developments in the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* described in the Gṛhyasūtras.

śrauta piṇḍapitṛyajña *in the Gṛhyasūtras*

A comparison of this ritual with the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* found in the Brāhmaṇas and the Śrautasūtras reveals a strong conservative tradition. In nearly all the Gṛhyasūtras, the details of the ritual are either abbreviated or omitted; instead the authors refer to the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*. This clearly is a reference to the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* of the *Śrautasūtras*. A few examples will suffice to reinforce this notion.[195] The grain offering is prepared in similar fashion. The use of the firebrand is preserved. Soma and Agni Kavyavāhana retain a place of honor, being worshiped early in the ritual. The sequence of offerings and *piṇḍa* offering remain the same. The '*namo vaḥ pitaro*' *mantras* first encountered in *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* 1.3.10 survive, though in a slightly altered form. The sacrificer still turns from the Pitṛs to afford them privacy in eating. Unsurprisingly, many of the *mantras* are identical to those of the older version of the ritual.

[195] Additionally, Oldenberg's cross references throughout his translation are invaluable in comparing the *gṛhya* and *śrauta* rituals. A detailed comparison, however, is beyond the scope of this study.

"New" Developments in the **piṇḍapitṛyajña**

Despite this conservative tendency, the Gṛhya ritual includes aspects that find no expression in the older ritual texts. First, as has been mentioned, is the introduction of a meat offering alongside the rice offering. Second, related to the domestic nature of the ritual, is the elimination of the priestly officials. Finally, there appears to be a notion of exchange between the Pitṛs and the householder that is emphasized more in the Gṛhya rites than in the older rituals.

Non-veg Offerings: A Complete Meal?

Each of the Gṛhyasūtras includes a meat offering on the second day of the *aṣṭakā*. *ĀśGS* 2.5.2, quoted above, mentions the preparation of meat offerings. Pāraskara states this at the beginning of the *aṣṭakās*: *apūpamāṃsaśākair yathāsaṃkyam*, "The (offerings) are cakes, meat, and vegetables, respectively" (*PGS* 3.3.3). The second *aṣṭakā* is the *anvaṣṭakya*, the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*. Thus meat is a part of the performance of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*. Śāṅkhāyana (*ŚGS* 3.13.2) mentions offering the omentum.[196] In the *Gobhila Gṛhyasūtra* the author explicitly states that the sacrifice has one mess of rice and one of meat.[197]

The introduction of meat into ancestor worship probably has its origins in the older tradition of domestic ancestor worship, i.e., the untraceable tradition that finds expression in the Gṛhyasūtras, but little can be done to find the origins of this custom beyond speculation. Perhaps the meat is intended to make the offerings to the Brahmins a complete meal. This would dovetail nicely with the conception of *śrāddha* as feeding the Pitṛs and the term *śraddhā*, often connected with the *śrāddha*. The word *śraddhā*,

[196] mahāvyāhṛtayaś catasro ye tātṛṣur iti catasronudrutya vapām juhuyād | *ŚGS* 3.13.2

[197] tasminn evāgnau śrapayaty odanacaruṃ ca māṃsacaruṃ ca pṛthaṅ mekṣaṇābhyāṃ prasvayam udāyuvan | *GGS* 4.2.14

conveys both a confidence in the efficacy of the ritual and of the power of hospitality (See Chapter 2 and Jamison 1996, 184). This is intimately tied with conception of the *śrāddha*, which I address below. While meat offerings are absent in the earlier tradition, it becomes a central concern of the *dharma* literature for the performance of a successful *śrāddha*.[198]

Elimination of Priests

While the rituals described in the Brāhmaṇas and the Śrautasūtras employed several priests, each of whom had distinct responsibilities in the ritual, the domestic ritual employs only the householder and his wife. The householder himself performs the majority of the ritual actions and his wife performs a few circumscribed aspects of the rite. This alteration derives from the nature of the genre, i.e., domestic ritual. This makes it possible for those who do not keep all the Vedic fires, or even the household fire perpetually, to perform the household rites. While it is clear that the domestic ritual tradition dates to a time prior to the composition of the Gṛhyasūtras, the fact that they were composed at this moment in time suggests an increased concern with domestic rites. The cause of this shift is lost to history, but the significance for the subsequent tradition is writ large on the classical notions of ritual in Hinduism. Obviously, the shift from priestly actors supporting a sacrificer to the householder as central ritual actor accounts for a considerable amount of the differences between Vedic and domestic ancestor worship. Curiously, most of this is obscured by the nature of the texts, i.e., the subject of the injunctions is frequently implied in both texts. Only by understanding the ritual from its context is the identity of the actor clear. But there are other differences; an example makes this clear.

[198] See Chapter 3.

In the *śrauta* ritual, the sacrificer employs the southern fire, one of three ritual fires employed in Vedic ritual, but the Gṛhyasūtras have a wider audience in mind. While only those that keep all three Vedic fires can engage in Vedic ritual, a householder with one fire, the domestic fire, can perform the *gṛhya* rites. Thus the author opens the option of kindling a fire for this ritual. In order to associate the fire with the south, where the Pitṛs dwell—an association generated by using the southern fire in the *śrauta* rite—he kindles the fire on earth inclined toward the south. This is one way that the ritualist creates connections between the ritual and the object of veneration, in this case the Pitṛs.[199] In this way the domestic ritual grants the opportunity for ritual relationships with supernatural beings to a larger sub-set of the Brahman population.[200] For the individual religious actor this meant greater personal involvement in the rituals to propitiate one's ancestors.

Exchange

Another aspect of the greater involvement in ancestral rites is the increased emphasis on the bilateral exchange between householder/descendent and Pitṛ/ancestor. In the older model of ancestor worship the exchanges between the sacrificer and his ancestors focuses on *piṇḍas* offered as food. Less explicitly, the sacrificer offers clothing to his ancestors by cutting his *daśā* (*TB* 1.3.10.7) or a piece of his *nivi* (*ŚB* 2.4.2.24). In the Śrautasūtras, these offering are more explicitly said to be clothing (*ĀpŚS* 1.10.1 and *ĀśŚS* 2.7.6). What I suggest is that an implicit expectation of some benefit in return for the execution of the

[199] For more on the *bandhu*, connection of association, created in ritual see Smith 1989. For the associations of different directions with different supernatural entities, see Smith 1995.
[200] This is not a much wider circle, as we are still talking only about Brahmins, but the gap between those who had the material wealth to support the large-scale Vedic ritual and those who could manage the much more private and less expensive domestic rites must have been wide. It is tempting to speculate on a trend of increasing inclusivity—on a spectrum from large-scale *śrauta* rites to private *gṛhya* rites to pilgrimage to *bhakti* devotionalism, a trend which seems evident even if one only focuses on ancestor worship—throughout Indian religious history, but that is far beyond the scope of this study.

ritual gradually becomes more explicit; the emphasis on the mutuality of the exchange enacted through ritual increases.[201]

In the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, the request for houses is the only overt request for something in return (*ŚB* 2.4.2.24). In the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* the author shows a fear of the danger of associating with the Pitṛs, who are dead after all. That fear is mitigated by the offering of the *daśā* mentioned above, an offering which garners offspring (*TB* 1.3.10.7). The association of the Pitṛs with offspring in strong in the Brāhmaṇas and the Saṃhitās and endures in the Śrautasūtras (see Chapter 3). This association finds material expression in the instruction for the wife to eat the middle *piṇḍa* if one desires sons (*KŚS* 4.1.22; *ĀśŚS* 2.7.12–13; *ĀpŚS* 1.10.10–11) and this custom continues in the Gṛhyasūtras (*GGS* 4.3.27).[202]

In the Gṛhyasūtras, however, the scope of this exchange expands considerably; I consider the example of the *Gobhila Gṛhyasūtra*. Beyond the offering of the collyrium, sesame oil, and perfume (4.3.13–16)—which are either selfless gifts as a part of the ritual or connected with the implicit reciprocity found in the older ritual—there is a series of mutual exchanges. After the *mantras* that implore for forgiveness of the householder, which scholars generally term the deprecation (Oldenberg 1967, 109), there begins a sequence of two way exchanges. In *GGS* 4.3.22–23 the householder asks his ancestors for houses and offers them an abode in return.

> gṛhān avekṣate gṛhān naḥ pitaro datteti | 22
> piṇḍān avekṣate sado vaḥ pitaro deṣmeti | *GGS* 4.3.22–23

[201] For more on the expectations and rewards of ritual, see Thite 1975.

[202] This only occurs in the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* of the *anvaṣṭakya*. Could it be that it is only associated with *piṇḍapitṛyajña* and not with *śrāddha*, at least for GS, then it changes later, as *piṇḍapitṛayajña* fades and *śrāddha* takes over its role, including some of the aspects not originally associated with *śrāddha*? Or is it there and simply assumed, with all the other details of the ritual?

22 He looks at his house and says "Give us a house, O Pitṛs!"
23 He looks at the *piṇḍas* and says "We give you an abode, O Pitṛs!"

The householder looks to his own home, indicating that this passage is not a straightforward request for a new house. He asks for the safety and security that a home ensures.[203] The author also makes the connection of the abode, *sadas*, granted with the *piṇḍa* explicit. It is the safety and security of a continued stay in heaven that the *piṇḍa* affords the Pitṛs. The householder gives his ancestors a continued existence in the *pitṛloka*, and they in turn grant him safety and security in his home here in this world.

These exchanges are but two explicit expressions of the reciprocal relationship between the householder and his ancestors. This relationship grows to be more interdependent in the later tradition.

The *śrāddha*: New Forms of Ancestor Worship

The other form of ancestor worship described in the Gṛhyasūtras is the *śrāddha*, a ritual that finds its first expression in these domestic manuals.[204] The traditions underlying the expressions of this ritual in the Gṛhyasūtras are the basis for the entire subsequent tradition of ancestor worship in Hinduism. Two significant developments mentioned previously, the Brahmin's role as stand-in for the Pitṛs and the process of the specialization of the *śrāddha*, are discussed in this section. The latter opens possibilities for understanding the origin and development of this ritual. The origin lies in a hoary past

[203] For more on the association with safety see 204f.
[204] The word *śrāddha* occurs only once in a text older than the Gṛhyasūtras, the *Katha Upaniṣad*.

> ya imaṃ paramaṃ guhyaṃ śrāvayed brahmasaṃsadi |
> prayataḥ śrāddhakāle vā tadānantyāya kalpate || *KaU* 3.17
>
> If a man, pure and devout, proclaims this great secret in a gathering of Brahmins, or during a meal for the dead, it will lead him to eternal life. (Olivelle)

Olivelle suggests that this and the preceding verses are later additions to the text intended to praise this text and reiterate the rewards of the knowledge contained therein (Olivelle 1996, 379). Thus we have no evidence to suggest that the term had any currency before the Gṛhyasūtras. In fact, I argue below that *śrāddha* is still a contested term in the Gṛhyasūtras.

beyond our apprehension, but the development, which is still evident throughout the extant Gṛhyasūtras, informs us of both the limits to the speculation about its origins and the manner in which the ritual came to have the four-fold form expressed therein.

The *śrāddha* first occurs in the Gṛhyasūtras and, in the *Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhyasūtra* already has four different forms: the *parvaṇa*, the *ekoddiṣṭa*, the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa*, and the *ābhyudayika*.[205] The *parvaṇa śrāddha* describes regular monthly ancestor worship, focused on the offering of *piṇdas* to the ancestors and modeled on the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*. Additionally, the name may derives from the *parvaṇa*, the name for a period in the phases of the moon. The *ekoddiṣṭa śrāddha* sustains the deceased father in the first year after his death, between the states of living father and Pitṛ in the *pitṛloka*. By performing the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa*, the deceased man's son promotes his father from this in-between state to the position of Pitṛ. In the process, he promotes each subsequent ancestor to the position of his predecessor, and the eldest Pitṛ, his father's great-grandfather, to the class of anonymous Pitṛs beyond the three involved in the *śrāddha* rite.[206] A householder performs an *ābhyudayika śrāddha* on any auspicious occasion, such as a wedding or the birth of a son.[207]

[205] Most details of the *śrāddha* occur in separate chapters devoted to that ritual, but other references do appear in the outline of the basic ritual paradigm, as exceptions. For example, *GGS* 2.4.1 interrupts the normal ritual procedure outline to indicate that instead of having the sacred thread over the left shoulder as in the normal ritual paradigm, it is to be over the right for the Pitṛs. Such occurrences occur quite frequently—for the shifting of the sacred thread see *ĀśGS* 1.2.10, *ĀpGS* 1.1.8; others are found inter alia.

[206] For a detailed description of this process and the ritual whereby it is effected, see Knipe 1977.

[207] For a different perspective on this type of *śrāddha*, see *Caraka Saṃhitā* 8.40, where Caraka lists materials used in the *nāndīmukha śrāddha*, which are gathered in the ninth month of pregnancy to prepare for the birth.

Four Types of **śrāddha**

Śāṅkhāyana deals with each of the four types of *śrāddha* in a separate chapter: the monthly offering, the *ekoddiṣṭa*, the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa*,[208] and the *ābhyudayika* (*ŚGS* 4.1–4).[209]

parvaṇa śrāddha

He first describes the basic *śrāddha*, elsewhere called the *parvaṇa śrāddha* since it is performed monthly, in this way:

> māsi māsi pitṛbhyo dadyād | 1
> brāhmaṇān vedavido 'yugmāṃs tryavarārdhān pitṛvad upaveśya | 2
> ayugmāny udapātrāṇi tilair avakīrya | 3
> asāv etat ta ity anudiśya brāhmaṇānām pāṇiṣu ninayed | 4
> ata ūrdhvam alamkṛtān | 5
> āmantryāgnau kṛtvā 'nnam ca | 6
> asāv etat ta ity anudiśya bhojayet | 7
> bhuñjāneṣu mahāvyāhṛtīḥ sāvitrīḥ |
> madhuvatīyāḥ pitṛdevatyāḥ pāvamānīś ca japed | 8
> bhuktavatsu piṇḍān dadyāt | 9
> purastād eke piṇḍān | 10
> paścimena tatpatnīnām kiṃcid antarddhāya | 11
> brāhmaṇebhyaḥ śeṣam nivedayed | 12
> agnaukaraṇādi piṇḍapitṛyajñena kalpo vyākhyātaḥ | *ŚGS* 4.1.1–13
>
> 1 He should offer to the Pitṛs monthly.
> 2 Having invited an uneven number of Brahmins, at least three, conversant in the Vedas, as the Pitṛs.
> 3 Having strewn an uneven number of water vessels with sesamum,
> 4 He should pour (the water) on the Brahmins' hands, assigning it (to them) with "This for you so-and-so!"
> 5 After this they are adorned.
> 6 Having saluted them and offer the food in the fire,
> 7 He should feed them, assigning it (to them) with "This is for you so-and-so!"
> 8 While they eat he should mutter the Mahāvyāhṛti, the Sāvitri, and the

[208] Śāṅkhāyana also describes the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa* in the fifth *ādhyaya* of the Pariśiṣṭa to the Gṛhyasūtra (*ŚGS* 5.9). In this respect, Oldenberg argues that 4.3 is a later addition to the text (1967, 109 n3,1).

[209] I will remind the reader that Śāṅkhāyana does not use the term *śrāddha* anywhere in his treatment of these rituals. The import of this omission is discussed below.

Madhuvatīya (formulas), which have the Pitṛs as their divinity, and the Pāvamāni.
9 When they have eaten, he should give the *piṇḍas*,
10 Some (say), before (eating) the *piṇḍas*,
11 Behind their wives, placing something in between.
12 He should present the remainder to Brahmins.
13 The rite of offering food into the fire and the rest is declared by the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*.

As the author mentions at the end, the procedure follows the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* in large part and, unlike the subsequent three types, this periodic ancestor worship does not differ greatly from the older *piṇḍapitṛyajña*. The differences, though, bear discussion. The *śrāddha* differs from the older model at the very outset; in *sūtra* 2 Brahmins are invited to the ritual. Further, they are said to represent the Pitṛs, *pitṛvad*. They receive the water to wash themselves, food offerings, and the *piṇḍas* on behalf of the Pitṛs; the import of this will be addressed shortly. Additionally, the author indicates, in verse 11, that the householder also offers *piṇḍas* to the wives of his Pitṛs. Whereas the earlier tradition focused solely on the Pitṛs, literally fathers, Śāṅkhāyana includes the wives of the householder's ancestors.[210] The instruction to follow the rules of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* indicates the relative conservative nature of the ritual; it is, at heart, a feeding of the ancestors. The three other *śrāddhas* described in this Gṛhyasūtra, however, address different purposes.

ekoddiṣṭa śrāddha

The *ekoddiṣṭa śrāddha*, as the name indicates, is a *śrāddha* aimed at one person. The surviving son of the deceased performs this ritual during the year following his father's death. According to later tradition, this supports the deceased person until his integration into the pantheon of the Pitṛs. Śāṅkhāyana's description is limited to the ways in which

[210] This tradition increases in frequency in the subsequent tradition, as evidenced in the *MBh* and several Purāṇas. Significantly, the author refers to the householder's female ancestors as wives, *tatpatni*, not with the term that becomes popular in the later tradition, *matṛ*, literally mother, in imitation of *pitṛ*, father.

this rite differs from the ordinary *śrāddha*, a point that emphasizes the paradigmatic status of the *parvaṇa śrāddha* in the mind of this and other *sūtrakāras*. This chapter merely outlines the alterations made to the *parvaṇa* for the *ekoddiṣṭa*.

> athāta ekoddiṣṭam | 1
> ekapavitram | 2
> ekārghyam | 3
> ekapiṇḍam | 4
> nāvāhanaṃ nāgnaukaraṇam nātra viśvedevāḥ |
> svaditam iti tṛptapraśna upatiṣṭhatām ity akṣayyasthāne | 5
> abhiramyatām iti visargaḥ | 6
> saṃvatsaram evam prete | 7
> caturthavisargaś ca | *ŚGS* 4.2.1–8
>
> 1 Now the *ekoddiṣṭa*.
> 2 There is one strainer.
> 3 One *ārghya*.
> 4 One *piṇḍa*.
> 5 There is no invitation; no offering into the fire; no Viśvadevas. The question about their being satiated is "Is it enjoyed?" In the place of "Imperishable," he says "May he approach (the Pitṛs)."
> 6 The send off is "May he be delighted!"
> 7 When one has died, it is thus for one year.
> 8 And the send off for the fourth (Pitṛ).

Not surprisingly the most significant change involves the number of ritual objects and offerings. Since the ritual aims to sustain only one person, instead of the usual three, the sacrificer makes only one filter to cover the water pot, only one *ārghya* offering, and only one *piṇḍa*. He does not invite the Pitṛs to the ritual, nor the Viśvadevas—a class of deities into which the Pitṛs are admitted after three generations more have become Pitṛs, as the ritual is aimed at the deceased alone. While he still expresses his concern about the offering satisfying the deceased, the *mantras* differ. This shift highlights the shift in emphasis with respect to the aim of this *śrāddha*. The shift from *akṣayya*, "Imperishable" to *upatiṣṭhatām ity akṣayyasthāne*, "May he approach the Pitṛs" changes the focus of the ritual. The term *akṣayyam* refers to the food offered to the Pitṛs, expressing the hope that

the offering to the Pitṛs will last forever. Since the ritual's aims to effect the transfer of the deceased to the status of Pitṛ, and not the regular feeding of the Pitṛs, the *mantra* that replaces this older *mantra* emphasizes that transition. The seventh *sūtra* indicates the duration; this *śrāddha* is performed for one year following death. The last *sūtra* probably refers to the liberation from the ritual cycle of the eldest Pitṛ, the sacrificer's great-grandfather, who is replaced in the tripartite pantheon of the Pitṛs by the deceased father. This promotion from Pitṛ to the class of anonymous ancestors beyond the three honored in the monthly *śrāddha* is normally associated with the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇ*a, but this simply offers more evidence for the fluid nature of the *śrāddha* rites. The ritual cycle is conceived of as continuous, not separable rituals; each of the *śrāddhas* are interrelated, culminating in the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa*.

sapiṇḍīkaraṇa śrāddha

ŚGS 4.3.1–8 describes the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa śrāddha*, which traditionally advances the deceased father to the status of Pitṛ. The great-grandfather is promoted to Viśvadeva and each subsequent Pitṛ advances one step. As with the *ekoddiṣṭa*, Śāṅkhāyana restricts himself to addressing the differences in the ritual, mentioning almost no ritual detail. The *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa* also shares with the *ekoddiṣṭa* a concern over numbers, by which we see the ritual process that integrates the father with the Pitṛs.

> atha sapiṇḍīkaraṇam | 1
> saṃvatsare pūrṇe tripakṣe vā | 2
> yad ahar vā vṛddhir āpadyeta | 3
> catvāry udapātrāṇi satilagandhodakāni kṛtvā | 4
> trīṇi pitṝṇām ekaṃ pretasya | 5
> pretapātram pitṛpātreṣv āsiñcati ye samānā iti dvābhyām | 6
> evaṃ piṇdam api | 7
> etat sapiṇḍīkaraṇam | *ŚGS* 4.3.1–8
>
> 1 Now the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa*.
> 2 At the conclusion of a full year, or three fortnights.
> 3 Or on a day when some success has occurred.

4 He arranges four water pots (filled) with sesamum, scents, and water.
5 Three for the Pitṛs and one for the deceased.
6 He pours the pot of the deceased into the pot of the Pitṛs with the two verses beginning "Those who are the same…"
7 Thus the *piṇḍa* too.
8 This is the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa*.

The *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa* occurs one year after death, though Śāṅkhāyana allows the option of doing it after three fortnights. He also allows for its performance on an auspicious occasion.[211] The integration of the deceased father into the class of Pitṛs is effected by the ritual joining of the water in the deceased's water pot with the water pots of the Pitṛs. *Sūtra* 7, in an extremely abbreviated fashion, indicates that one should do the same with the *piṇḍas*. Śāṅkhayana's treatment of the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa* in the fifth *ādhyaya* addresses the distribution of the deceased's *piṇḍa* more explicitly.

atha sapiṇḍīkaraṇam | 1
catvāry udapātrāṇi pūrayitvā pituḥ prabhṛti | 2
tadvat piṇḍān kalpayitvā | 3
ye samānāḥ samanasaḥ pitaro yamarājye |
teṣām lokaḥ svadhā namo yajño deveṣu kalpatām |
ye samānāḥ samanaso jīvā jīveṣu māmakāḥ |
teṣām śrīr mayi kalpatām asmin loke śatam samāḥ |
samāno mantra iti dvābhyām ādyam piṇḍam triṣu vibhajet | 4
tathaivārghapātrāṇi | 5
evaṃ mātur bhrātur bhāryāyāḥ pūrvamāriṇyā ebhiḥ piṇḍaiḥ prakṣipya | *ŚGS* 5.9.1–6

1 Now the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa*.
2 Having filled four water pots, beginning with the father,
3 Having, in the same way, arranged (four) *piṇḍas*,
4 "May the world, *svadhā*, reverence, and sacrifice of those Pitṛs who are equal and unanimous in the realm of Yama be arranged among the gods." "May I share in the glory of those living of mine who are equal and unanimous among the living in this world for one hundred years." He should distribute the first *piṇḍa* into the (other) three with the two (verses) beginning "The same *mantra*…"
5 In the same way with the *ārghya* vessels.

[211] The import, implications, and possible explanation of this connection are beyond me. Generally, this kind of statement refers to the *ābhyudayika śrāddha*. It is possible that this is the origin of the *ābhyudayika*, though determining this would require more insight into the develop of *śrāddha* than is presently available.

6 Thus having thrown with these *piṇḍas* for his mother, brother, wife who predeceases him.

The two accounts of the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa* in the *Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhyasūtra* complement each other: both describe one part of the ritual integration of the deceased father into the company of the Pitṛs.[212] The father is integrated into the Pitṛs, as—or perhaps by—the integration of his water and his *piṇḍa* into that of the Pitṛs.

ābhyudayika śrāddha

The last form of *śrāddha* has little to do with the death on one's father; it calls on the Pitṛs in their role as progenitors and dispensers of wealth, a theme clearly expressed in both the Brāhmaṇas and the Śrautasūtras.[213] A householder performs the *ābhyudayika śrāddha* on auspicious occasions[214] and the adjustments to the ritual paradigm reinforce the shift from a ritual associated with death to one promoting life.[215]

athāta ābhyudayikam | 1
āpūryamāṇapakṣe puṇyāhe | 2
mātṛyāgam kṛtvā | 3
yugmān vedavida upaveśya | 4
pūrvāhṇe | 5
pradakṣiṇam upacāraḥ | 6

[212] This supports Oldenberg's view, to the extent at least that one section is prior to the other.
[213] See Chapter 3.
[214] This also appears in the *Kauśikasūtra*, though this author employs the term *piṇḍapitṛyajña*. *KauśS* 11.5[84].5 tells us that a *piṇḍapitṛyajña* with meat was performed before a wedding. If this refers, as I suspect it does, to the *ābhyudayika*, the *śrāddha* performed on such auspicious occasions, then this may contradict my sharp distinctions between *piṇḍapitṛyajña* and *śrāddha*. However, it may also indicate a greater fluidity to the terms indicating ancestor worship. It is unclear from this single odd usage. For more on the ambiguous nature of the terminology and the development of the categories for which those terms are used see p. 160f.
[215] Consider *GGS* 1.1.5, which at the very outset of the Gṛhyasūtra indicates there should be an *anvāhārya* at the beginning of every rite, *sarvāṇy evā 'nvāhāryavanti*. The commentary asserts that this is a *nāndīmukhaśrāddha* and Oldenberg expressed doubt about this being the correct interpretation (Oldenberg 1967, 13 fn. 5). He suggests it refers to an offering of a mess "like that offered after the dar*s*apûr*n*amâsau sacrifices to the officiating priests" (Oldenberg 1967, 14, fn.5). Manu uses this term as a generic term for an offering, see p. 174, but there seems to be some association between the *anvāhārya* and the *śrāddha*. See especially *GGS* 4.4.3 and *MDhŚ* 3.122; in both the term seems to modify the word *śrāddha*, though only by implication in the former. The exact nature of this connection is not at all clear.

pitṛmantravarjaṃ japaḥ | 7
ṛjavo darbhāḥ | 8
yavais tilārthaḥ | 9
dadhibadarākṣatamiśrāḥ piṇḍāḥ | 10
nāndīmukhān pitṝn āvāhayiṣya ity āvāhane | 11
nāndīmukhāḥ pitaraḥ prīyantām ity akṣayyasthāne | 12
nāndīmukhān pitṝn vācayiṣya iti vācane | 13
sampannam iti tṛptapraśnaḥ | 14
samānam anyad aviruddham iti | *ŚGS* 4.4.1–15

1 Now the *ābhyudayika*.
2 On the fortnight of the waxing moon on a meritorious day.
3 Having done the sacrificer to the Matṛs.
4 Having invited an even number of (Brahmins) who are conversant in the Veda.
5 In the earlier part of the day.
6 He performs (the rite) in a clock-wise manner.
7 He mutters, omitting the *mantras* dedicated to the Pitṛs.
8 The *darbha* grass is straight.
9 With barley instead of sesamum.
10 The *piṇḍas* are mixed with coagulated milk, jujubes, and un-husked barley corns.
11 At the invitation he says "I will invite the Nāndīmukha Pitṛs."
12 In the place of "Imperishable" he says "May the Nāndīmukha Pitṛs be delighted."
13 At the talking he says "I will make the Nāndīmukha Pitṛs speak."
14 The question about their being satisfied is "Is it palatable?"
15 The rest is the same for it is consistent (with the other *śrāddhas*).

This *śrāddha* occurs during the waxing moon, differing from the normal *śrāddha*, which is performed during the waning moon (*ĀpGS* 8.21.10).[216] The Pitṛs association with death makes clear the connection to the waning, i.e., dying, moon. Thus the reversal of the *ābhyudayika śrāddha* seeks to invoke the increasing, i.e., waxing, moon. That this type of *śrāddha* is sometimes called the *vṛddhi śrāddha*, *śrāddha* of increase, should not be surprising.[217] Other changes reflect this reversal from death and inauspicious associations to positive, auspicious associations: inviting an even number of Brahmins, instead of the

[216] The *piṇḍapitṛyajña* too is performed during the waning moon (*ĀśGS* 2.4.1; 2.5.9).
[217] Cf. *ĀśGS* 2.5.1–15.

usual uneven number;[218] the change from the afternoon, the normal time for performance of the *śrāddha* to the forenoon; and performing the ritual *pradakṣiṇa*, clockwise or right to left, instead of the usual left to right (*ĀśGS* 4.7.12). In fact, the *mantras* that mention the Pitṛs are omitted. In this way the *sūtrakāra* eliminates the direct associations of the ritual and its participants with the Pitṛs, particularly the inauspicious associations with the Pitṛs, associations which make ritual connections with death.

Additionally, the connection to the Pitṛs as benefactors is emphasized. First, those elements the regular *śrāddha* that highlight the Pitṛs' benevolence remain unchanged. Second, the name Nāndīmukha Pitṛs, glad-faced Pitṛs, suggests their benevolent aspect.[219] Finally, the shift of *mantras* highlights the shift in emphasis with respect to the aim of this *śrāddha*, as seen in the *mantra* substitution in the *ekoddiṣṭa śrāddha*. The shift from *akṣayya*, "Imperishable" to *nāndīmukhāḥ pitaraḥ prīyantām*, "May the Nāndīmukha Pitṛs be delighted" changes the focus of the ritual. The term *akṣayyam* refers to the food that is offered to the Pitṛs, offering the hope that what is offering to the Pitṛs last forever. Since

218 The influence of this newer conception of ancestor worship on the *piṇḍpitṛyajña* can be seen in the closing remarks on the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* in *GGS*. Gobhila 4.3.35 says that if the ritual is for a lucky event or an auspicious occasion, then the number of Brahmins should be even; *vṛddhipūrteṣu yugmān āśayet*.

219 The later conception of the Nāndīmukha Pitṛs as the Pitṛs who have been promoted beyond the first three ancestors into a class of more remote, satisfied, and therefore, benevolent supernatural beings may have been behind this term as early as the Gṛhyasūtras, but there is very little evidence to suggest this. The two pre-Purānic occurances I was able to locate, which happen to be cited by both Monier-Williams and Böhtlingk and Roth as evidence of this meaning, are: *ŚGS* 4.4.1 and *YS* 1.250. The former is quoted on the previous page, the later is equally ambiguous and occurs in a time period where the nature of the *śrāddha* had, firstly, moved beyond the contestation evident in the Gṛhyasūtras, and secondly, had already been established as a central aspect of *dharma*, having undergone the radical changes in its conception that this work is yet to discuss. I suggest that the substitution of the Nāndīmukha Pitṛs for the Pitṛs—if it is indeed a substitution and not merely an adjective describing the state of mind with which the worshipper implores his ancestors to approach the ritual—should be read in the context of the other systematic changes that occur in the shift from the paradigmatic *śrāddha*, which necessarily involves an association with the Pitṛs as dead people, to the *śrāddha* that seeks to invoke their beneficent aspect. That is to say, the shift is better understood as one more way to modify a ritual usually associated with death to one that celebrates life. The understanding of the Nāndīmukha Pitṛs as a specific class of Pitṛs, i.e., those beyond receiving food in the *śrāddha*, is clearly a part of the later tradition, but reading that understanding into the Gṛhyasūtras, where the nature of the *śrāddha* itself is still under contestation, is hypothetical at best and anachronistic at worst.

the aim of this ritual is not the regular feeding of the Pitṛs, but an invocation of their ability to benefit the ritualist, the *mantra* that replaces this older *mantra* aims to please the Pitṛs. Not only does the *mantra* state the householder's hope that they are pleased, but it also emphasizes that they should be cheerful. The term *nāndī* suggests satisfaction, gladdening. By invoking this aspect of the Pitṛs, and deemphasizing their inauspicious aspects, the householder celebrates great moments in his life, invoking the Pitṛs benevolence and deemphasizing their association with death.

Before returning to the process of differentiation of the *śrāddha* into specialized types, the innovations evident in the *śrāddha* merit discussion.

Two Innovations

The *śrāddha* evidences the two developments seen in the *gṛhya piṇḍapitṛyajña* and discussed above: the inclusion of meat offerings and the elimination of the cadre of Vedic priests. In addition, two other developments appear in the domestic ancestor worship of the *śrāddha*: the specialization of the ritual into rites with specific purposes—seen in the four-fold division illustrated above—and the inclusion of Brahmins in the ritual, most particularly their inclusion as stand-ins for the Pitṛs. The Brahmin becomes a proxy for the offerings to the deceased.

Feeding Brahmins and Brahmins as Proxy

In the *śrauta* rituals the main participants in the rites are the four priests and the sacrificer. In the Gṛhya ritual the Hotṛ, Adhvaryu, Udgatṛ, and Brahman priests are given few responsibilities[220] and the householder performs most of the ritual actions and relies on his wife to perform some functions. Additionally, the Brahmins take on new

[220] This is not without exception, however; Āśvalāyana reviews the process of selecting the priests (*ĀśGS* 1.23).

prominence in the ritual; the feeding of Brahmins is incorporated into the definition of a particular sacrifice.

Āśvalāyana defines three kinds of *pākayajñas* another term for domestic rituals indicating cooked offerings, using the '*huta* scheme' discussed in Chapter 1.

> trayaḥ pākayajñāḥ hutā agnau hūyamānā anagnau prahutā brāhmaṇa-bhojane brahmaṇi hutāḥ | *ĀśGS* 1.1.2
>
> There are three *pākayajñas*: *huta*, which are offered into the fire; *prahuta*, which are not offered into the fire; and what is offered into the Brahmin at a Brahmin Feeding.

Āśvalāyana names the first two, *huta* and *ahuta*, but fails to name the last, merely describing the offering that is giving food to a Brahmin.

Śāṅkhāyana lists four types: *huta*, *ahuta*, *prahuta*, and *prāśita* (*ŚGS* 1.5.1).[221] Later he defines them, as Āśvalāyana did, though finding new meanings.

> huto agnihotrahomenāhuto balikarmaṇā |
> prahutaḥ pitṛkarmaṇā prāśito brāhmaṇe hutaḥ. | *ŚGS* 1.10.7
>
> An *huta* (is made) by performing an oblation in an Agnihotra; an *ahuta* (is made) by performing a bali offering.
> A *prahuta* (is made) by performing a Pitṛ offering; a *prāśita* is offered into a Brahmin.

Despite the different categorization of the types of *pākayajñas*,[222] both authors agree that giving food to a Brahmin is an integral part of domestic ritual life. And indeed the

[221] *PGS* 1.4.1 lists the same four types. Baudhāyana lists seven:

> yatho etad dhutaḥ prahuta āhutaś śūlagavo baliharaṇaṃ pratyavarohaṇam aṣṭakāhoma iti sapta pākayajñasaṃsthā iti | *BGS* 1.1.1
>
> *huta*, *prahuta*, *āhuta*, an offering of an ox on a spit, bali offering, redescent, and offering an oblation in an *aṣṭakā*: these together make up the seven *pākayajñas*.

As the additional rituals listed by Baudhāyana occur in the other Gṛhyasūtras, this seems to be a case of expansion of a category. The other rites are included to inflate their importance. As to whether this helps us in establishing a relative chronology, I do not know.

[222] I discuss the different categorizations of the *pākayajña* in greater detail in Chapter 1.

feeding of Brahmins is mentioned quite frequently in the Gṛhyasūtras.[223] Most often the injunction to feed Brahmins occurs quite plainly at the end of the description of a ritual. For example, at the end of the Aśvayuja ritual, Śāṅkhāyana says,

> atha brāhmaṇabhojanam | *ŚGS* 4.16.5
> Then the feeding of Brahmins.

Frequently, the Brahmin will be implored to declare the day meritorious and proclaim the success of the endeavor.

> brāhmaṇān annena pariviṣya puṇyāhaṃ svastyayanam ṛddhim iti vācayitvāthaitāṃ rātriṃ vasanti | *HGS* 2.7.17.13
> Having served food to Brahmins and caused them to say " (This is a) meritorious day! Blessings! Prosperity!" They rest that night.

Despite the inclusion of the feeding of Brahmins in the lists of *pākayajñas*, in his outline of the basic ritual paradigm Śāṅkhāyana tells us that feeding of Brahmins is a customary part of performing the domestic rituals.

> karmāpavarge brāhmaṇabhojanam | *ŚGS* 1.2.1
> At the conclusion of rites (there is) the feeding of Brahmins.

In fact, only once is there a statement that suggests Brahmins are not to be fed at the end of any particular ritual. At the end of his description of the *anvaṣṭakya*, Hiraṇyakeśin says:

> annadhanadāne tv atrāniyate | *HGS* 2.5.15.12
> He does not here engage in the giving of food or gifts.

[223] *ĀśGS* 2.4.13; 2.4.16; 2.5.11; 2.9.9; 3.8.6; 4.6.18; 4.7.21; *ŚGS* 1.2.1; 1.11.8; 2.8.2; 2.14.19–22; 3.11.16; 4.1.12; 4.8.20; 4.16.5; 5.2.9; 5.5.13; *PGS* 1.2.13; 1.10.5; 1.12.5; 1.15.9; 1.19.13; 2.1.5; 2.2.5; 2.9.11; 2.13.8; 2.14.26; 2.15.10; 2.16.6; 2.17.19; 3.1.7; 3.4.19; 3.5.5; 3.9.8; 3.10.48; *GGS* 1.1.6; 1.5.25; 1.9.1–4; 3.8.6; 4.3.35; 4.6.13; *HGS* 1.2.7.25; 1.2.8.7; 1.4.13.16; 1.5.17.6; 1.7.23.5; 1.8.27.1; 2.1.1.3; 2.1.6.2; 2.5.15.12; 2.7.17.13; *ĀpGS* 3.7.15; 4.10.5; 6.14.2; 6.16.1; 7.17.13; 7.18.12; 8.21.2; *BGS* 1.1.22; and 1.2.58 are most representative of the variety of applications of feeding of Brahmins.

Its explicit omission, along with the *sūtras* enjoining it mentioned above, indicates that the feeding of Brahmins is, ordinarily, an integral part of the domestic ritual. But it is just not any Brahmin who is to be fed.

Gobhila too enjoins the feeding of Brahmins in his outline of the basic ritual paradigm, but adds a qualification.

> apavarge 'bhirūpabhojanaṃ yathāśakti | *GGS* 1.1.6
> At the conclusion (of the rites) there is the feeding of the learned (Brahmins), according to his ability.

The *sūtrakāras* all agree that only Brahmins of learning[224] and good moral character should be invited to a ritual. This concern receives a more detailed treatment in Chapter 3. Here only one expression of the feeding of Brahmins is discussed, a manifestation of the feeding of Brahmins that takes on particular import for a study of ancestor worship, namely the Brahmin standing in for the deceased.

Brahmin as Stand-in for the Pitṛs

Āśvalāyana and Śāṅkhāyana both tell us that the Brahmin stands in for the deceased father during the *śrāddha*.

> brāhmaṇāñ śrutaśīlavṛttasampannān ekena vā kāle jñāpitān snātān kṛtapacchaucān ācāntān udanmukhān pitṛvad upaveśyaikaikam ekaikasya dvau dvau trīṃs trīn vā | *ĀśGS* 4.7.2
> He should cause Brāhmaṇas who are endowed with learning, character, and (good) behavior, or with one (of these), who were informed at the proper time,

[224] I follow the near-consensus among the commentators who read *abhirūpa* to mean learning, though the word quite frequently means simply handsome, while acknowledging that this interpretation may lean more heavily on later traditional interpretations that the original texts. However, the passages that employ this term, as will be seen, rarely rely only on merely this term to determine the qualifications of the Brahmin to be invited. Further work needs to be done to determine how frequently this term alone qualifies the Brahmin to take on this role and how frequently it is used as part of a longer list of qualifications. This particular passage, with *abhirūpa* as the sole criterion, suggests that the authors may have been relying on the older ritual qualifications as a model for this new religious behavior of feeding a Brahmin, that is to say, the perfection of the body as a condition for participation in *śrauta* ritual probably informed the *gṛhya* traditions choices in whom to invite to a ritual. This needs to be explored more fully in the context of the shifts in religious behaviors that this study begins to explore.

who have bathed, who are purified to their feet, who have sipped water, to sit down as the Pitṛs, with their faces to the north, one for one, two for two, or three for three.

brāhmaṇān vedavido ayugmāṃs tryavarārdhān pitṛvad upaveśya | *ŚGS* 4.1.2

Having invited an uneven number of Brahmins, at least three, conversant in the Vedas, sit as the Pitṛs.

Both authors use the term *pitṛvad*, as the Pitṛs; Oldenberg's translation, "representing the Pitṛs," makes the relationship more clear. The Brahmins stand in for, literally sit in the place of, the Pitṛs, acting as their proxy for the oblations that the sacrificer makes in the *śrāddha*. The following passages demonstrate that the Brahmins physically stand in for the Pitṛs.

ayugmāny udapātrāṃ tilair avakīryā | 3
asāv etat ta ity anudiśya brāhmaṇānāṃ pāṇiṣu ninayet | 4
ata ūrdhvam alamkṛtān | 5
āmantrya agnau kṛtvā 'nnam ca | 6
asāv etat ta ity anudiśya bhojayed | *ŚGS* 4.1.3–7

3 Having strewn an uneven number of water vessels with sesamum,
4 He should pour (the water) on the Brahmins' hands, assigning it (to them) with "This for you so-and-so!"
5 After this they are adorned.
6 Having saluted them and put the food in the fire,
7 He should feed them, assigning it (to them) with "This is for you so-and-so!"

The sacrificer washes the Brahmins as he washed the Pitṛs in the older ritual, and feeds them, as he fed the Pitṛs in the older ritual. The Brahmins not only symbolically represent the Pitṛs, they actually receive the offerings made to the Pitṛs, on their behalf; they mediate the exchange between son and father, between householder and ancestor.

Āśvalāyana's language expresses the Brahmins' role as physical stand-in less explicitly, but it is clear nonetheless that the Brahmin receives the offerings of the Pitṛs and serves as a physical proxy for interacting with the Pitṛs. After stating the qualities of the Brahmins to be invited and how they are to be seated (*ĀśGS* 4.7.2, quoted above) the author indicates that the greater the number of Brahmins invited the greater the benefit

derived from the rite, but that one can never have only one Brahmin stand in for all the Pitṛs.[225] Then the author turns to the procedure, where the Brahmins' role becomes clear.

The sacrificer interacts with the Brahmins as if they were the Pitṛs.

apaḥ pradāya | 7
darbhān dviguṇabhugnān āsanam pradāya | 8
apaḥ pradāya | *ĀśGS* 4.7.7–9

7 Having given water (to the Brahmins),
8 Having presented (them) with doubly-bent *darbha* (grass) as a seat,
9 Having presented (them) with water,

While the text does not indicate the object of the presentation of water and a seat, the subject thus far has been the Brahmins and, as is common in the *sūtra* style, an understood element of the composition is omitted to increase the brevity of the work. The intended audience of this text would understand that the invited Brahmin was the object of these actions.

Later the author gives us another clue.

etasmin kāle gandhamālyadhūpadīpācchādanānām pradānam | 17
uddhṛtya ghṛtāktam annam anujñāpayaty agnau kariṣye karavai karavāṇīti vā | 18
pratyabhyanujñā kriyatām kuruṣva kurv iti | 19
athāgnau juhoti yathoktam purastāt | 20
abhyanujñāyām pāṇiṣv eva vā | *ĀśGS* 4.7.19–21

17 At that time the gift of perfume, garlands, incense, lights, and clothing (is made).
18 Having drawn out food smeared with ghee, he asks for permission, "I will do it in the fire." Or "I shall do it in the fire." Or "I am going to do it in the fire."
19 Permission (is given with) "May it be done." Or "Do it." Or "Go and do it."
20 He then offers into the fire as previously mentioned.
21 Or, with their permission, in the hands (of the Brahmins).

After presenting gifts—the same gifts that appear in the older ritual—and asking the Brahmins for permission to make an offering into the fire, they do so. Optionally, he may make this offering into the hands of the Brahmin. That the subject previous to the

[225] vṛddhau phalabhūyastvam | 3 na tv evaikam sarveṣām | 4 *ĀśGS* 4.7.3–4

unstated object of the presentation was the Brahmins and that the sacrificer is making an offering into a hand makes it clear that the Brahmins are the object of the presentations made in this entire section.

Quoting a Brāhmaṇa, Āśvalāyana reiterates the notion that the Brahmins convey the offerings to the Pitṛs.

> agnimukhā vai devāḥ pāṇimukhāḥ pitara iti ha brāhmaṇam | *ĀśGS* 4.7.22
>
> It says in a Brāhmaṇa, "The gods have Agni as their mouth, the Pitṛs have the hand as their mouth."

As Agni mediates between the sacrifice and the gods, so does the Brahmin mediate between the ritualist and the Pitṛs, between the householder and his ancestors. One option for making the offerings to the Pitṛs involves offering the food into the hands of Brahmins; when they accept the food it is on behalf of the Pitṛs.

Hiraṇyakeśin, during the preparation of food to be offered to the Brahmins, instructs the sacrificer to touch the food with a *mantra*.

> athānnam abhimṛśati | pṛthivī te pātraṃ dyaur apidhānaṃ brahmaṇas tvā mukhe juhomi brāhmaṇānāṃ tvā prāṇāpānayor juhomi | akṣitam asi mā pitṝṇāṃ kṣeṣṭhā amutrāmuṣmiṃl loke | pṛthivī samā tasyāgnir upadraṣṭā dattasyāpramādāya | … *HGS* 2.4.11.4
>
> Then he touches the food with "The earth is your vessel; heaven is your cover. I sacrifice you into the mouth of the Veda; I sacrifice you into the in and out breath of the Brahmins. You are undecaying. Do not decay for the Pitṛs there in yonder world. The earth is constant; Agni is his witness, so that what is given is not neglected…."

The mouth of the Veda, *brahmaṇas mukhe*, indicates the Brahmins who are to receive the food. Since the Brahmins keep and recite the Veda, they are the mouthpiece of the Veda.[226] This *mantra* reiterates the notion that the offerings are being made to the

[226] Bodewitz offers a different interpretation for the *BGS* of the same text:

Brahmins in the place of the Pitṛs.[227] Brahmins have come to replace the fire as the mediator between the householder and his ancestors.[228]

This notion appears explicitly in the Dharmasūtra of Āpastamba. In the mythic introduction to the ancestral offerings, Āpastamba says:

> tatra pitaro devatā brāhmaṇās tv āhavanīyārthe | *ĀpDhS* 2.16.3
> In this (ritual) the Pitṛs are the divinity, but the Brahmins stand in for the offertorial fire.

These authors express the Brahmins' role as mediator in two ways. First, they stand in for the fire, acting as Agni does to convey the oblations to the gods. A Brahmin with these qualities is able to take on such a role; the failure of a Brahmin of poor moral character to take on this role is discussed in greater detail in later literature (see Chapter 4). Other *sūtrakāras* express this role with the term *pitṛvad*, as the Pitṛs; the Brahmins act as proxy for the Pitṛs, accepting their offerings and conveying to them the benefit thereof.

The Brahmins' role as stand-in for the Pitṛs is a feature of all four types of *śrāddha* in the Gṛhyasūtras and appears to have been so in all four types throughout the

> "The Earth is thy vessel, heaven is the lid (i.e. this food represents all the food of the cosmos). I offer thee in the mouth of brahman (the cosmic principle, which creates and consumes all food and life, here conceived as an eating person). I offer thee in the ex- and inhalation of learned Brahmins (who are in fact the human representatives of brahman)" (Bodewitz 1973, 261).

He then says:

> This sacrifice in the mouth of brahman seems to be regarded as a cosmic prāṇāgnihotra in which the five Brahmins represent the five fires or *prāṇāḥ* of the eating brahman. This interpretation (which I propose with some hesitation) may explain the use of the term *niviṣṭa-* in the five formulas, which in the context of the prāṇāgnihotra is not easy to explain (Bodewitz 1973 261).

Despite this difference of interpretation, which I need to explore more carefully and decide if it is detrimental to my understanding, he does, elsewhere, suggest a relationship between the sacrifice into the breaths and the *śrāddha*.

[227] The relationship of the in and out breaths mentioned here and the internalization of the ritual fire that plays such a central part in the upaniṣadic re-invention of ritual in the context of renunciation needs to be explored further. If some relationship does exist, it would indicate a more complex relationship between two soteriological ideologies, namely the heaven oriented ideology expressed in the *śrāddha* and the *mokṣa* oriented ideology found first in the Upaniṣads, that rarely intersect in any text prior to the Purāṇas, though the Dharmasūtras and Manu both record elements of both without any attempt to reconcile them.

[228] I discuss this in greater detail in Chapter 4.

development that is apparent in the Gṛhyasūtras. That development began sometime before the composition of the *Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhyasūtra*, perhaps in the inaccessible lived tradition before the composition of the Gṛhyasūtras. However, it is clear that this process was not complete by the time of the Gṛhyasūtras' composition. Different Gṛhyasūtras capture different moments in the codification of the *śrāddha* and its types.

Specialization

A review of the different *śrāddhas* in the Gṛhyasūtras reveals some of the process whereby these four clear types that Śāṅkhāyana outlines became the norm for the subsequent tradition. The extant Gṛhyasūtras do not agree completely on terminology, categorization, or even perhaps a basic conception of the *śrāddha* ritual. This diversity could be a function of *śākhā* differences, temporal differences, other influences hidden by the nature of the genre in which the evidence is found, or, as is more likely, a combination of the above; however, it does indicate that *śrāddha* is a contested category in the Gṛhyasūtras.

Discussion of this development requires an a conceptual step back to address the distinction between *piṇḍpitṛyajña* and *śrāddha*, since this is more basic to the questions of categorization and specialization. With this distinction understood, we can better understand the development of the four-fold *śrāddha* as seen in the different Gṛhyasūtras.

***piṇḍapitṛyajña* versus *śrāddha*: Clear-cut Distinctions?**

As the terms *piṇḍapitṛyajña* and *pitṛyajña* distinguished between the two ancestor worship rituals of the earlier tradition,[229] distinct terminology distinguishes between

[229] The term *pitṛyajña* is very nearly absent from the Gṛhyasūtras; I was only able to locate one instance of the term *pitṛyajña* in a context that discussed ancestor rituals directly (Twice it occurs in the context of the *mahāyajñas*: *ĀśGS* 3.1.2–3; for more on this concept, see Chapter 4.). *KauśS* describes the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* and, after declaring the manner of the oblation's preparation, says,

different modes of ancestor worship in the Gṛhyasūtras.[230] The two occurrences of ancestral rites in the Gṛhyasūtras are: 1. the rituals of the second day of the *aṣṭakā* festival, the *anvaṣṭakya*, and 2. the *śrāddha*, periodic offerings of food to the Pitṛs.

The *piṇḍapitṛyajña* most frequently is employed as a referent ritual to explicate the performance of the *anvaṣṭakya*, for example:

> śvonvaṣṭakyaṃ piṇḍapitṛyajñāvṛtā | *ŚGS* 3.13.7
> On the next day is the *anvaṣṭakya*, performed in accordance with the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*.

> apare dyur anvaṣṭakyam | 1
> …
> piṇḍapitṛyajñakalpena | *ĀśGS* 2.5.1,3
> 1 On the following day, the *anvaṣṭakya*.
> …
> 3 According to the procedure for the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*.[231]

> havir hyeva pitṛyajña | 11.8[87].11
> For the oblation is certainly the *pitṛyajña*.

Kauśikasūtra uses the term as a synonym for the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*, effectively declaring the oblation the essential aspect of the rite. The older distinctions between the *pitṛyajña* and the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* seem to have faded away.

230 However, the tradition does not accept the strict distinctions between *pitṛyajña* and *piṇḍapitṛyajña* that I have employed, and one aspect of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* of the Gṛhyasūtras may reveal some influence between these two different rites. In the Vedic ritual the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* is a monthly rite and the *pitṛyajñá* is a seasonal rite (see last section). Thus it was slightly surprising to find that the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* performed as a part of the *anvaṣṭakya* ritual takes place in the month of Mārgaśīrṣa (ŚGS 3.12.1, ĀśGS 2.3.1), as part of a seasonal sacrifice. This aligns with the timing of the *pitṛyajña*, which takes place in the month of Kārtika of Mārgaśīrṣa (Kane 1941, 1100). It is possible that the monthly rite is lifted from its ordinary context and employed in a new context; it is also possible that there is some influence from the association of the month of Mārgaśīrṣa with the Pitṛs. Additionally, both these factors may be at play.

231 See also *PGS* 3.3.10; *GGS* 4.4.1 (see the next footnote). Āpastamba curiously treats *śrāddha* first (*ĀpGS* 8.21–22) and bases his treatment of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* performed as a part of the *aṣṭakā* (which he refers to with the term *piṇḍanidhāna*, not *piṇḍapitṛyajña*) with *śrāddha* as the model (*ĀpGS* 8.22.8–12). Hiraṇyakeśin—whose Gṛhyasūtra is clearly later, being based on that of Āpastamba—does the same (*śrāddha*: 2.4.10–13; *anvaṣṭakya*: 2.4.14–15). If one Āpastamba is responsible for the Śrauta-, Gṛhya-, and Dharma- Sūtra of Āpastamba and Olivelle is correct in dating him to the beginning of the third century BCE, then Āpastamba may be late among the Gṛhyasūtras. If this is correct, then, I suggest, this reversal of the treatment of *śrāddha* may be due to the rise in popularity of the *śrāddha*, over and against the *śrauta* rituals of ancestor worship, subsequent to, perhaps due to, the shift that is evident in the Gṛhyasūtras.

But the term is used, at least once,[232] as the referent ritual for the *śrāddha*. At the end of the description of the *parvaṇa śrāddha*, Śāṅkhāyana concludes with this *sūtra*.

> agnaukaraṇādi piṇḍapitṛyajñena kalpo vyākhyātaḥ | *ŚGS* 4.1.13
> The procedure of putting into the fire etc. (*sūtra* 6) have been declared by the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*.

The *gṛhyasūtrakāras* adopted the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* as the model for ancestor worship, be it in the *anvaṣṭakya* or the *śrāddha*.[233] At some point, however, the *śrāddha* becomes so popular that it supplants the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* as the paradigm of ritual performance. Āpastamba, unlike other *sūtrakāras*, describes the *śrāddha* before he addresses the *anvaṣṭakya*; he defines the latter as a special case of the former.

> anvaṣṭakāyām evaike piṇḍanidhānam upadiśanti | 9
> athaitad aparaṃ dadhna avāñjalinā juhoti yayā 'pūpam | 10
> ata eva yathārthaṃ māsām śiṣṭvā śvobhūte 'anvaṣṭakām | 11
> tasyā māsiśṛāddhena kalpo vyākhyātaḥ | *ĀpGS* 8.22.9–12
>
> 9 Some prescribe the presenting of *piṇḍas* at the *anvaṣṭakya*.
> 10 Now, this is another: he offers *dadhi*, with his hand folded together, as the cake.
> 11 Having left over as much as is needed from that, on the next day is the *anvaṣṭakā*.
> 12 The procedure for that has been explained by the monthly *śrāddha*.

[232] GGS 4.4.1 has been read to refer to the *śrāddha*; I argue this is mistaken. Consider the passage:

> anvaṣṭakyasthālīpākena piṇḍapitṛyajño vyākhyātaḥ | 1
> amāvāsyāṃ tac chrāddham | 2
> itarad anvāhāryam || *GGS* 4.4.1–3
>
> 1 The *piṇḍapitṛyajña* is explained by the Anvaṣṭakya Sthālīpāka (barley oblation).
> 2 This is the *śrāddha* (performed) on the new moon;
> 3 another is the Anvāhārya (*śrāddha*).

This immediately follows Gobhila's discussion of the *anvaṣṭakya* and follows a mode of reference common in this Gṛhyasūtra. The author, in other contexts, caps off a discussion with just such a *sūtra*, e.g., 1.8.26–29 and 3.8.32–36. Additionally, indicating the manner of completion of the current rite by reference to another rite almost never occur in the first *sūtra* of a section, e.g., *ŚGS* 4.1.13. I argue that its similarity to the reference style, e.g., *ĀśGS* 2.5.3 and *PGS* 3.3.10, and the later traditions confluence of these two distinct types of ancestor rites contributed to its erroneous inclusion at the beginning of the next section.

[233] Śāṅkhāyana's statement is echoed in *ĀśGS* 4.7.6, though in briefer terms: *piṇḍair vyākhyātam* |.

It seems that by the time of Āpastamba the *śrāddha* held the place of prominence among ancestral rites. Another factor that impacts the understanding of the way different terminology is used in the Gṛhyasūtras is the absence of the term *śrāddha* in discussions of rituals that are clearly *śrāddha*.

***Absence of the Label* śrāddha**

Two authors do not use the term *śrāddha* to refer to that ritual; this fact may help illuminate the history of the term itself. For the sake of clarity I repeat the first lines of each chapter from Śāṅkhāyana's introduction to the four types of *śrāddha* seen above:

> māsi māsi pitṛbhyo dadyād | *ŚGS* 4.1.1
> He should give to the Pitṛs monthly.
>
> athāta ekoddiṣṭam | ŚGS 4.2.1
> Now the *ekoddiṣṭa*.
>
> atha sapiṇḍīkaraṇam | ŚGS 4.3.1
> Now the sapiṇḍīkaraṇa.
>
> athāta ābhyudayikam | ŚGS 4.4.1
> Now the ābhyudayika.

All but the first announce the ritual to be described by name. The first section, however, simply describes the ritual, "He should give to the Pitṛs every month." While this certainly refers to the ritual other texts call the *parvaṇa śrāddha*, as the Nārāyaṇa and Oldenberg both indicate in their commentaries (Rai 1995, 150; Oldenberg 1967, Part I 106 n.1), the author fails to use that word. In fact, he does not use the term *śrāddha* anywhere in the section describing the *śrāddha*.

The term *śrāddha* occurs in the *Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhyasūtra* only three times and always in the same context, the interruption of Vedic recitation (*ŚGS* 4.7.5; 4.7.55; 6.1.7). Of these, one is in a chapter that Oldenberg argues belongs to a later addition (Oldenberg

1967, Part I, 11) and the other two are members of a list, which makes dating extremely difficult. While speculating on the originality of these versions may be pointless, it is worth noting that the author did not use the term *śrāddha* to refer to the *śrāddha* ritual itself. The only other author who fails to use the word *śrāddha* in his description of that ritual is Pāraskara,[234] but his description of the *śrāddha* seems to be an aside emended to the funerary rites and he follows the convention, common in the *sūtra* literature, of prescribed actions without unnecessary labels.

It is highly unlikely that Śāṅkhāyana and Pāraskara knew the term *śrāddha* yet failed to use it. The *sūtra* genre values brevity over almost every other quality of a text, including sometimes clarity. It seems unlikely then, that the author would use two words, *pitṛbhyo dadyād*, when one would do, *śrāddha*. This is clearly seen in the other authors' work on *śrāddha* as well. Gobhila for example introduces the section on *śrāddha* in this way.

> amāvāsyāyāṃ tat śrāddham | *GGS* 4.4.2
> This is the *śrāddha* (performed) on the new moon.

The details of both the *Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhyasūtra*, which includes a separate section for each of the four types of *śrāddha*, and the *Pāraskara Gṛhyasūtra*, which mentions far less detail, but it clearly aware of at least three kinds of *śrāddha*, suggest that they knew the ritual we now call *śrāddha*. Their failure to use the term suggests that the term had not gained currency in either their time or their cultural sphere.

With the usage of the more general terminology better understood, I turn to the four-fold *śrāddha*, to illuminate its development within the composition of the Gṛhyasūtras.

[234] Pāraskara too uses the term *śrāddha* in the section on the interruption of Vedic recitation (*PGS* 2.11.2).

Categories: Blurred Distinctions and all

The illusion of consistency and formal organization created by the review of Śāṅkhāyana's sections on the different types of *śrāddha* contradicts the heterogeneous conceptions of *śrāddha* that are expressed in the Gṛhyasūtras. While Śāṅkhāyana describes four types of *śrāddha* in some detail, though without using the term *śrāddha*, Āśvalāyana mentions three types at the beginning of his section on *śrāddha*, but never distinguishes between any of the practical aspects of their procedure in his description. Gobhila mentions the monthly *śrāddha*, but no other type of *śrāddha*. Pāraskara describes the ritual of *śrāddha*, but does not use the term *śrāddha* or any of the names for different types of *śrāddha*, though, as I will show, one does find hints of other types.

While these four are consistent at least in treating *śrāddha* after the *anvaṣṭakya*, and sometimes in terms of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*, both Āpastamba and Hiraṇyakeśin treat *śrāddha* first and the *anvaṣṭakya* as a special case of the *śrāddha* (*ĀpGS* 8.22.9–12; *HGS* 2.5.15). Additionally, neither author mentions any type of *śrāddha* beyond the monthly performance. Table 6 outlines the different types of *śrāddha* that each Gṛhyasūtra describes and indicates whether the author uses that specific term to refer to the ritual at hand.

Despite lacking the clear-cut distinctions that Śāṅkhāyana makes between the different types of *śrāddha*, other *sūtrakāras* similarly differentiate between the types of *śrāddha*. The manner of the distinction, however, is often obscured by the *sūtra* style of this genre. Additionally, this derives, to one degree or another, from the fact that the author assumes his audience already has considerable understanding of the material.[235]

[235] For more detail on the nature of *sūtra* literature, see Gonda 1980, Oldenberg 1967, and Olivelle 2000.

Specifically, the *sūtrakāras* assumed that his audience would understand his abbreviated references to the different types of *śrāddha*. Explanation requires some examples.

	ŚGS	*ĀśGS*	*GGS*	*PGS*	*ĀpGS*	*HGS*
śrāddha	○	●	●	○	●	●
parvaṇa	○	●	○	○	○	○
ekoddiṣṭa	●	●		○		
sapiṇḍīkaraṇa	●	? [236]		○		
ābhyudayika	●	●				
śrāddha first					●	●

Table 6: Reference to different types of *śrāddha* in the Gṛhyasūtras.
Filled dots indicate the text describes that ritual with that term.
Empty dots indicate that the text describes that ritual without that term.

As indicated by Table 6, Pāraskara discusses these different *śrāddhas*, but fails to label them as such. He does not deal with *śrāddha* in a separate section, as Āśvalāyana does (*ĀśGS* 4.7), or in four different sections, as Śāṅkhāyana does (*ŚGS* 4.1–4). Instead Pāraskara addresses the different forms in a rather cryptic few *sūtras* in the section that addresses the rituals surrounding the death of a relative. Only ten *sūtras* in all deal with offerings to the dead.

> pretāya piṇḍaṃ dattvā 'vanejanadānapratyavanejaneṣu nāmagrāham | 27
> mṛnmaye tāṃ rātrīṃ kṣīrodake vihāyasi nidadhyuḥ pretātra snāhīti | *PGS* 3.10.27–28
>
> 27 Having given a *piṇda* to the deceased, taking his name at the washing, the giving, and the second washing,
> 28 That night they should put milk and water in an earthen vessel in an open space, (saying) "Bath here deceased one."
>
> ekādaśyām ayugmān brāhmaṇān bhojayitvā māṃsavat | 48
> pretāyoddiśya gām apy eke ghnanti | 49
> piṇḍakaraṇe prathamāh pitṝṇāṃ pretaḥ syāt putravāṃś cet | 50
> nivareta caturthaḥ| 51

[236] At least one commentary suggests that 4.7.5 refers to the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa*, but I see no strong evidence for this interpretation.

saṃvatsaraṃ pṛthag eke | 52
nyāyas tu na caturthaḥ piṇḍo bhavatīti śruteḥ | 53
ahar ahar annam asmai brāhmaṇāyodakumbhaṃ ca dadyāt | 54
piṇḍam apy eke nipṛṇanti | *PGS* 3.10.48–55

48 On the eleventh (day), having fed an uneven number of Brahmins (a meal) with meat,
49 Some kill a cow in the name of the deceased.
50 At the making of the *piṇḍas* the deceased becomes first of the Pitṛs, if he has sons.
51 A fourth (piṇḍa) is prohibited.
52 Some (give the *piṇḍa* separately) for a year.
53 There is a rule, however, from *śruti*, "There is no fourth *piṇḍa*."
54 Every day he gives him food, to a Brahmin a pot of water also.
55 Some offer *piṇḍas* too.

The first two *sūtras*, situated as they are in the middle of a discussion of death pollution practices, clearly refer to some practice to propitiate the deceased. *Sūtra* 48 appears to refer to the *ekoddiṣṭa śrāddha* performed eleven days after the death of the father and the commentary confirms this for us.[237] The term *piṇḍakaraṇa* in *sūtra* 50 could refer to several different *śrāddhas*, but the outcome of this rite, namely the deceased father becoming first of the Pitṛs, makes clear that Pāraskara refers to the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa*. This ritual promotes the father to the station of Pitṛ from that of *preta*. The next *sūtra* indicates that there cannot be four *piṇḍas*, i.e., the father must be integrated into the Pitṛs, and there can only be three Pitṛs when this is accomplished. This further confirms that the author refers to the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa*.

Pāraskara then gives the opinion of other teachers, "Some (give *piṇḍas* separately) for a year," then quickly reminds his audience that there can be no fourth *piṇḍa* according to *śruti*. But there seems to be some confusion here. *sūtra* 50 refers to the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa*, which other texts tell us lasts for a year (*ŚGS* 4.3.2), why then does Pāraskara attribute

[237] ekādaśyām ekādaśe 'hani brāhmaṇaḥ kartā cet ayugmān triprabhṛti viṣama saṃkhyākān dvijottamān bhojayitvā bhojanaṃ kārayitvā ekoddiṣṭaśrāddhavidhinā māṃsavat māṃsena sahitaṃ pāyasaudanādi bhavati | (*Pāraskara-Gṛhyasūtram* 2001, 175)

this practice to other teachers? The last *sūtra* too sounds like *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa*. In short the tradition preserves a rather cryptic outline of the *śrāddha*. This, I suggest, is due in part to the contested nature of the term *śrāddha*.

Āśvalāyana too includes a cryptic passage similar to what we have just discussed in the *Pāraskara Gṛhyasūtra*. In the section on the *anvaṣṭakya*, Āśvalāyana sums up his discussion of that ritual in this way:

> etena māghyāvarṣam proṣṭhapadyā aparapakṣe | *ĀśGS* 2.5.9
>
> By this (one knows) the Māghyāvarṣa (rite done) on the dark half of the moon following the Proṣṭhapadyā full moon.

He thereby signals the end of his discussion of the *anvaṣṭakya*. But he continues with a related subject, other forms of ancestor worship. The indication of offering to the Pitṛs monthly is enough to indicate that he is moving to a new topic.

> māsi māsi ca evam pitṛbhyo ayukṣu pratiṣṭhāpayet | 10
> navāvarān bhojayet | 11
> ayujo vā | 12
> yugmān vṛddhir pūteṣu | 13
> ayugmān itareṣu | 14
> pradakṣiṇam upacāro yavais tilārthaḥ | *ĀśGS* 2.5.10–15
>
> 10 And so he should offer to the Pitṛs every month, with uneven (numbers).
> 11 He should feed at least nine (Brahmins).
> 12 Or an uneven (number).
> 13An even (number) at a *vṛddhi* (*śrāddha*) or an auspicious occasion.
> 14 An uneven (number) at other (*śrāddhas*).
> 15 The mode (for this ritual) is *pradakṣiṇa*; sesamum is replaced with barley.[238]

Like Pāraskara, Āśvalāyana packs a considerable about of information into these five *sūtras*. The first two *sūtras* refer to the monthly *parvaṇa śrāddha*; the monthly performance and the uneven number of Brahmins indicate this. He then shifts gears, referring to the *vṛddhi śrāddha*, elsewhere called the *ābhyudayika*. This *śrāddha* happens

[238] Bhaṭṭakumārila's commentary on this the second half of this *sūtra* reads: *tilakārye yavān kūryāt*, "In rites employing sesamum, he should use barley." I follow him in translating this rather strange grammar.

on auspicious occasions and requires an even number of Brahmin invitees.[239] Āśvalāyana clearly knows that his audience understands the details of this *śrāddha*, merely referring to the number of Brahmins as short hand to indicate the rite. Considering that Āśvalāyana deals with the *śrāddha* in greater detail in a later section (*ĀśGS* 4.7), his summary treatment here indicates a intriguing possibility. A few points of comparison first: the above passage refers to three of the four *śrāddha*s but fails to use the term *śrāddha*; 4.7 refers to the same three, but uses the term *śrāddha* and each of the three individual types' names; the above passage occurs at the end of the discussion of the *anvaṣṭakya* and makes brief mention of the rites; and 4.7 is a section dedicated to this rites and described the ritual in great detail, including *mantras*. It seems likely that this passage is an older remnant and that 4.7 is a secondary, more mature description. The similarity of the above passage to the treatment in the *PGS*, where *śrāddha* finds no mention, suggests that *ĀśGS* records an older and a newer description of the monthly ancestral rites, one from a period where the term *śrāddha* had not gained currency, another after the name *śrāddha* and the labels for the different types had gained currency. Another marker of this development is seen in *ĀpGS* and *HGS*.

Āpastamba—and Hiraṇyakeśin, who draws heavily from Āpastamba—preserves a different style in recording the *śrāddha* ritual. Instead of dealing with the *śrāddha* after the *aṣṭakā* rituals, as most Gṛhyasūtras do, he deals with *śrāddha* in its own section and incorporates the *anvaṣṭakya* as a subsidiary rite, a special instance of the *śrāddha*. This probably indicates, as mentioned briefly above, a period in the development of the *śrāddha* when that rite had taken over the role of paradigm of ancestor worship. No longer is the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* the paradigm that both the *anvaṣṭakya* and the *śrāddha* refer

[239] See *ŚGS* 4.4.

to, but the *śrāddha* now is the archetype of ancestor worship. It is difficult to draw conclusions about the chronological relationships of these texts based merely on the expressions of ancestor worship generally and the four-fold *śrāddha* specifically, but the above discussed passages and the variety in which the ancestral rites are discussed are suggestive. More work needs to be done of the relative chronology of the Gṛhyasūtras.

ŚRĀDDHA IN THE *DHARMA* LITERATURE

The *śrāddha* gains tremendous popularity after the period of the Gṛhyasūtras, and while it is impossible to make any causal connections, it can be said that the forms that the *śrāddha* takes on in the Gṛhyasūtras become the dominant models for the subsequent tradition. In the *dharma* literature, the Dharmasūtras and subsequently the Dharmaśāstras, the importance of the *śrāddha* to the fulfillment of the householder's *dharma* cannot be underestimated. This section addresses a few features of the treatment of *śrāddha* in the Dharmasūtras and the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*, focusing on the manner and context of their descriptions of *śrāddha*. The primary concern of the *dharma* texts is fundamentally different from that of the ritual *sūtras* discussed thus far. The aim of this next genre of texts is the proper fulfillment of *dharma*; they give few details about the nitty-gritty of the rituals; they focus more on the meta-issues, e.g., what type of Brahmin is to be invited, what type of meat is to be offered, etc. What follows is limited to a preliminary discussion of the manner and context of discussions of *śrāddha*. In Chapter 3 these newer concerns and their function in the larger social context receive fuller treatment.

***śrāddha* in the Dharmasūtras**

Of the two types of ancestor worship discussed in the Gṛhyasūtras, *piṇḍapitṛyajña* and the *śrāddha*, the former does not appear in any of the four Dharmasūtras. Additionally, the *aṣṭakā* and *anvaṣṭakya* ceremonies, involving the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* of the Gṛhyasūtras,

only finds mention in the Dharmasūtras a handful of times: in a list of different rituals (*GDhS* 8.18), the suspension of Vedic recitation (*GDhS* 16.38; *BDhS* 1.21.4; *VDhS* 13.22), and as a special case of the *śrāddha* (*BDhS* 2.15.9; *VDhS* 11.43).[240] The *śrāddha*, on the other hand, receives considerable attention.

The Dharmasūtras address primarily the *parvaṇa śrāddha*. Three of the *sūtrakāras* mention specifically that one should perform the rite monthly.

> māsi māsi kāryam | 4
> aparapakṣasyāparāhnaḥ śreyān | 5
> tathāparapakṣasya jaghanyāny ahāni | *ĀpDhS* 2.16.4–5
>
> 4 (The *śrāddha*) is to be performed every month.
> 5 The afternoon of the later fortnight is best.
> 6 Also the last days of the later fortnight.

> atha śrāddham | 1
> amāvāsyāyāṃ pitṛbhyo dadyāt | 2
> pañcamīprabhṛti vāparapakṣasya | 3
> yathāśraddhaṃ sarvasmin vā | *GDhS* 15.1–4
>
> 1 Now the *śrāddha*.
> 2 He should give to the Pitṛs on the new moon.
> 3 Or beginning on the fifth (day) of the later fortnight.
> 4 Or on any (day of the fortnight) according to one's *śraddhā*.

> aparapakṣa ūrdhvaṃ caturthyāḥ pitṛbhyo dadyāt | *VDhS* 11.16
>
> He should give to the Pitṛs after the fourth day of the later fortnight.

The *parvaṇa śrāddha* is the only *śrāddha* that occurs on a monthly schedule, but beyond the indication of its frequency the generic procedural references support two readings: either 1. the author discusses the *parvaṇa śrāddha* because it is the paradigm, leaving the

[240] This shift, from the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* as the model on which the *śrāddha* is based to the *śrāddha* as basic paradigm of ancestor worship, certainly seems to indicate a change in conceptions of ancestor worship over time, which may in turn help determine the relative chronology of different texts, Gṛhya- and Dharmasūtras. This need to be explored more, but I tentatively suggest that the Gṛhyasūtras that treat the *śrāddha* first, with the *aṣṭaka piṇḍapitṛyajña* as a special case of that ritual are later than those for whom the *śrāddha* appears to derive from the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*. This would mean that Āpastamba is one of the later Gṛhyasūtras, followed by Hiraṇyakeśin who is generally agreed to draw upon Āpastamba.

other types of *śrāddha* performances to the accumulated knowledge of tradition, or 2. he speaks to the *śrāddha* more generally, simply restraining from making any reference to a specific *śrāddha*, because his concerns apply to all *śrāddhas*. Either interpretation is plausible. Gautama and Baudhāyana both indicate that an uneven number of Brahmins should be invited,[241] indicative of the *parvaṇa, ekoddiṣṭa*, and *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa*, but Āpastamba and Vasiṣṭha fail to mention whether the number of Brahmins should be even or uneven. What is significant for my review of the *śrāddha* in the Brahmanical literature, is that by the time of the Dharmasūtras, the *śrāddha* is an integral part of the *dharmic* life and requires little detailed explanation.

The few details about procedural aspects of the *śrāddha* agree with the Gṛhyasūtra account of the ritual. This should not be surprising as the Dharmasūtras, though addressing a more universally conceived topic, *dharma*, still follow the ritual tradition handed down through *śākhā* lineages. Reading Vasiṣṭha's section on ancestor worship, however, makes it clear that this genre, the Dharmasūtras, had moved beyond the limited scope of ritual concerns. His thoughts on *śrāddha* seem to be limited to a few *sūtras* on the time and quality of Brahmins to be invited and several *ślokas* expressing general wisdom about the *śrāddha*—twenty-two loosely connected verses which address some aspect of the *śrāddha*—rather than a sustained argument or narrative. The material available from the Dharmasūtras expresses new concerns about the *śrāddha*; the procedures no longer require explanation—the genre would certainly not be the place for such details—but the genre dictates new concerns over the performance of the *śrāddha*. These are addressed in Chapter 3.

[241] navāvarān bhojayed ayujaḥ | *GDhS* 15.7; …tryavaraṇ ayujaḥ … nimantraya … | *BDhS* 2.14.6

śrāddha in the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*

Manu's introduction to ancestor worship differs from that of the Dharmasūtras in several respects and indicates more clearly the newer concerns of the *dharma* tradition vis-à-vis *śrāddha*. It first appears in a section that defines the duties of the householder by describing the five great sacrifices, an overview of the great sacrifices which takes up fifty-three *ślokas*. The section on ancestor worship that follows includes one-hundred sixty-three *ślokas*. Considering the treatment the other great sacrifices receives in the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*, none more than twenty-six verses, Manu gives the *śrāddha* a lot of space.[242] The form of ancestor worship mentioned in his overview of the five great sacrifices, however, differs from the longer section that follows.

In his overview of each of the five great sacrifices, Manu reviews the *śrāddha* with these two *ślokas*:

> dadyād ahar ahaḥ śrāddham annādyenodakena vā |
> payomūlaphalair vāpi pitṛbhyaḥ prītim āharan || 82
> ekam apy āśayed vipraṃ pitrarthe pāñcayajñike |
> na caivātrāśayet kiṃ cid vaiśvadevaṃ prati dvijam || *MDhŚ* 3.82–83
>
> 82 He should make ancestral offering every day with food or water, or even with milk, roots, and fruits, gladdening his ancestors thereby. 83 He should feed at least a single Brahmin for the benefit of his ancestors as part of the five great sacrifices; at this he should never feed even a single Brahmin in connection with the offerings to the All-gods. (Olivelle)

The *śrāddha* he describes here is the daily offerings to the ancestors made as a part of the new obligations defined by the doctrine of the five great sacrifices.

[242] Verses addressing Vedic study specifically amount to thirteen (*MDhŚ* 2.164–172; 4.4.95–100). If I were to include the life of a *brahmacarya*, which is related to Vedic study, or other verses related to Vedic recitation more generally the totals would be closer, but the total given above refers only the sustained discussion of *śrāddha*, thus the basis of comparison is lost. My point here is that in the context of the great sacrifices, *śrāddha* appears to have been of more concern to Manu than the other great sacrifices.

When Manu begins his more detailed description of the *śrāddha* and the concerns that are associated with its proper execution, he couches the conversation in a much different context.

> pitṛyajñaṃ tu nirvartya vipraś candrakṣaye ‘gnimān |
> piṇḍānvāhāryakaṃ śrāddhaṃ kuryān māsānumāsikam || 122
> pitṝṇāṃ māsikaṃ śrāddham anvāhāryaṃ vidur budhāḥ |
> tadāmiṣeṇa kartavyaṃ praśastena prayatnataḥ || MDhŚ 3.122–123
>
> 122 Having performed the *pitṛyajña*, a Brahmin who possesses the sacred fire should perform the *piṇḍāṇvāhārya śrāddha* monthly on the new moon.
> 123 The wise call the monthly *śrāddha* to the Pitṛs the *anvāhārya*; it is to be done diligently with the meat that has been proclaimed.

Manu makes a distinction here between the *pitṛyajña*, a *śrauta* ritual, and the *śrāddha*, a *smārta* ritual. Like the earlier authors he distinguished between the two types of rites with the terms used.[243] Unfortunately the term *anvāhārya* occurs in only these two places in all of the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*, so we must turn to the Dharmasūtras for its meaning. In all three of its occurrences in the Dharmasūtras (*ĀpDhS* 2.7.2; *BDhS* 2.17.18; 2.18.8) it has a general meaning of sacrifice. In only one other text, to my knowledge, is the term *anvāhārya* associated with the *śrāddha*, the *Gobhila Gṛhyasūtra* (*GGS* 1.1.5, quoted above, and 4.4.3).

> anvaṣṭakyasthālīpākena piṇḍapitṛyajño vyākhyātaḥ | 1
> amāvāsyāṃ tac chrāddham | 2
> itarad anvāhāryam || *GGS* 4.4.1–3

[243] It is curious here, in light of my sustained efforts to demonstrate that almost all the authors carefully distinguish between different types of ancestor worship with different terms, that the term *pitṛyajña* has taken on a different meaning here. It is not completely surprising as in the larger context of the *MDhŚ* the term has taken on a few different meanings. Foremost is one of the five great sacrifices (*MDhŚ* 3.70; 4.21). But is also appears, as here, to refer to the older *śrauta* ritual. Elsewhere it seems to imply a broad term including both. At *MDhŚ* 3.282 (in the derivative form *paitṛyajñiyo*) Manu prohibits offering ancestral oblations into an ordinary fire, thus the term appears to apply to ancestral offerings in a very general way: na paitṛyajñiyo homo laukike ‘gnau vidhīyate | na darśena vinā śrāddham āhitāgner dvijanmanaḥ || *MDhŚ* 3.282. At *MDhŚ* 3.282 Manu says that merely offering water to the ancestors after a bath grants him the same fruit as a *pitṛyajña*, which, again, seems like a general term for ancestor worship: yad eva tarpayaty adbhiḥ pitṝn snātvā dvijottamaḥ | tenaiva kṛtsnam āpnoti pitṛyajñakriyāphalam || *MDhŚ* 3.283.

1 The *piṇḍapitṛyajña* is explained by the Anvaṣṭakya Sthālīpāka (barley oblation).
2 This is the *śrāddha* (performed) on the new moon;
3 another is the Anvāhārya (*śrāddha*).

As argued earlier, *sūtra* 1 belongs with the previous and *sūtra* 2 introduces the *parvaṇa śrāddha*. The *anvāhārya*, then, initially appears to be another type of *śrāddha*, but both rituals are monthly and there seems to be no distinguishing between them. When we factor in the Dharmasūtra uses of the word, it seems to be a general term for offering, perhaps performed in a specific manner. It seems, then, that Manu is simply describing the *śrāddha* as the offering of *piṇḍas*.

Ancestor worship in the beginning of the Common Era is clear in the minds of the Brahmanical authors; the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* of the *śrauta* rites survives, though it occupies the mind of the Brahmanical authors of this period considerably less than the *śrāddha*. The *śrāddha* has become the paradigmatic form of interacting with the ancestors and has four particular forms: the *parvaṇa*, the *ekoddiṣṭa*, the *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa*, and the *ābhyudayika*. The most basic element of the *śrāddha* is the offering of food to the ancestors, a common element in each of the four types, despite their different aims. The *ekoddiṣṭa* sustains the deceased father from his cremation to his promotion into the ranks of the Pitṛs. The *sapiṇḍīkaraṇa* promotes him to the status of Pitṛ. The *parvaṇa* sustains him in heaven with monthly offerings of food, symbolized by the *piṇḍas*. The *ābhyudayika śrāddha* grants the householder access to the beneficent powers of his ancestors without the need to engage their death-related aspects; it marks, and empowers, auspicious occasions such as births and marriages. This picture of ancestor worship in the

Brahmanical tradition is well known; the role of ancestor worship in ancient Buddhist, however, is little studied.[244]

BUDDHIST HISTORY

This section addresses Buddhist reflections on ancestor worship generally and *śrāddha* specifically. Reading from the *Sutta Nikāya* of the Pāli Canon will show that the authors of these early Buddhist texts actively engaged with the householder concern over the *śrāddha* specifically and openly accepted the centrality of ancestor worship more generally to their conception of the householder. Examples from the *Petavatthu* evidence a Buddhist practice of ancestor worship that resembles the Brahmanical conception of *śrāddha* closely.

Most of the references to ancestor worship in the Pāli Canon are not explicit discussions of the *śrāddha*; they are aspects of brief descriptions of the duties and obligations of the average householder seeking advice from the Buddha or one of his disciples. The passages from the Buddhist texts used in Chapter 1 to demonstrate the centrality of ancestor worship to the construction of the householder will not be repeated here. Instead this section addresses one direct reference to *śrāddha* from the *Anguttara Nikāya* and a ritual pattern in the *Petavatthu* that suggests ancestor worship was more central to Buddhist conceptions of religiosity than previous scholarship has acknowledged.[245]

[244] As to the former, I suggest that most studies of ancestor worship in India focus on this model of ancestor worship, specifically the *śrāddha*, to the exclusion of others. This myopic understanding of Indian traditions of ancestor worship usually manifest in one of two ways: ignoring the earlier tradition or conflating the earlier tradition with the later. See the Introduction for more on the scholarly context of this study.

[245] I am tempted to suggest that the pattern apparent in the *Petavatthu* suggests that the *śrāddha* was constitutive in the construction of later Buddhist ideas of giving and the mechanism of accruing merit by such giving, but that exceeded the scope of this study. Others have explored this more fully than I; see p. 19.

Jāṇussoṇisutta

The earliest reference to *śrāddha* in the Buddhist materials occurs in the *Jāṇussoṇisutta* of the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*. Jāṇussoṇi the Brahmin comes to visit the Buddha and asks him about *śrāddha*.

> Mayamassu bho gotama brāhmaṇā nāma dānāni dema saddhāni karoma: idaṃ dānaṃ petānaṃ ñātisālohitānaṃ upakappatu, idaṃ dānaṃ petā ñātisālohitā paribhuñjantu'ti. Kacci taṃ bho gotama dānaṃ petānaṃ ñātisālohitānaṃ upakappati? Kacci te petā ñātisālohitā taṃ dānaṃ paribhuñjanti ti? *A* v.269
>
> We, O Gotama, the Brahmins, give gifts, (we) perform *saddhas*: saying "May this gift benefit the kinsmen and blood relations who have departed. May the kinsmen and blood relations who have departed eat this gift." Does this gift, O Gotama, benefit the kinsmen and blood relations who have departed? Do the kinsmen and blood relations who have departed eat this gift?

This seems a particularly relevant place to start since Jāṇussoṇi asks the Buddha to reflect on a common householder practice, one usually considered an exclusively Brahmanical practice by scholars. The Buddha, however, quickly turns the questions toward specifically Buddhist concerns; he responds very succinctly, prompting the Brahmin to ask for clarification.

> ṭhāne kho brāhmaṇa upakappati, no aṭṭhāneti.
> Katamañca bho gotama ṭhānaṃ? Katamaṃ aṭṭhānanti? *A* v.269
>
> If it is the proper place, O Brahmin, it benefits, if it is not the proper place, it does not.
> And what is the proper place, O Gotama? What is not the proper place?

The Buddha then proceeds to list the crimes and destinations earned thereby for the person living such-and-such a life, then identifies that destination as either the proper place or not. For each type the Buddha lists their crimes, indicates the destination, says that they will subsist on the food proper to dwellers in that place, and informs us that he subsists by that. He then indicates whether that destination is the proper place for the offerings made in the *saddha*, if so they benefit him, if not they don't. As would be

expected by anyone familiar with the Pāli Canon, several wrong examples are given first. Consider, the first:

> Idha brāhmaṇa ekacco pāṇātipātī hoti, adinnādāyī hoti kāmesu micchācārī hoti, musāvādī hoti, pisunavāco hoti, pharusavāco hoti, samphappalāpī hoti, abhijjhālū hoti, vyāpannacitto hoti, micchādiṭṭhiko hoti, so kāyassabhedā paraṃ maraṇā nirayaṃ upapajjati. Yo nerayikānaṃ sattānaṃ āhāro tena so tattha yāpeti, tena so tattha tiṭṭhati. Idampi kho brāhmaṇa aṭṭhānaṃ yattha ṭhitassa taṃ dānaṃ na upakappati. *A* v.269
>
> In this world[246] when someone, O Brahmin, who is a destroyer of life, a thief, a misbehaver in sexual pleasure, a liar, a slanderer, one with rough speech, one who talks nonsense, is covetous and malevolent, has a wrong view (heresy), dies he is reborn in hell. There he is nourished by that which is the food of those beings dwelling in hell and there he abides by that. That, O Brahmin, is not the proper place, where what is given to one who abides there does not benefit him.

This pattern applies to all the examples the Buddha enumerates. In short the person who commits all these crimes is reborn in one of three places: 1. *niraya*, hell, 2. *tiracchāna-yoni*, an animal womb, or 3. *petti visaya*, the realm of the *pettis*.[247] Each of these lives on the food appropriate to those in that realm and abides by that food. Those who abstain from committing such crimes are reborn either in the company of men, *manussānaṃ sahavyataṃ*, or in the company of gods, *devānaṃ sahavyataṃ*. In all but one case, the Buddha informs Jāṇussoṇi that the reborn person does not benefit from the gifts given, as we say with those reborn in *niraya* above. These places are not the proper place for the offerings made in the *saddha* to reach their intended goal; the *petti visaya* is the proper place. After the usual formula, the Buddha says:

> Yaṃ vā panassa anuppavecchanti mittā vā amaccā vā ñāti vā sālohitā vā, tena so tattha yāpeti. Tena so tattha tiṭṭhati. Idaṃ kho brāhmaṇa ṭhānaṃ, yattha ṭhitassa taṃ dānaṃ upakappatī ti. *A* v.270

[246] The word *idha* can here mean either 'with respect to this' or 'here in this world.'
[247] For a list of the five stations in which one can be reborn see the *Mahāsīhanādasutta*, *M* i.73.

> What friends, co-workers, kinsmen, and blood relations present to him, by that, there, he is nourished. By that he abides there. This, O Brahmin, is the proper place, where what is given to one who stands benefits him.

The *petti visaya*, then, is the only place where the offering made in *śrāddha* actually feeds the deceased. Only the *petas* receive the food offered in the *śrāddha*, a fact verified by the Buddha himself.

> Sace pana bho gotama so peto ñātisālohito taṃ ṭhānaṃ anuppanno hoti, ko taṃ dānaṃ paribhuñjatīti?
> Aññepissa brāhmaṇa petā ñāti sālohitā taṃ ṭhānaṃ anupapattā honti. Te taṃ dānaṃ paribhuñjantī ti.
> Sace pana bho gotama so ceva peto ñātisālohito taṃ ṭhānaṃ anupapanno hoti, aññepissa petā ñātisālohitā taṃ ṭhānaṃ anupapannā hontī. Ko taṃ dānaṃ paribhuñjatī ti?
> Aṭṭhānaṃ kho etaṃ brāhmaṇa, anavakāso yaṃ taṃ ṭhānaṃ vicittaṃ assa iminā dīghena addhunā yadidaṃ petehi ñāti sālohitehi. Api ca brāhmaṇa
> dāyakopi anipphalo hoti. *A* v.270

> If, O Gotama, that kinsman or blood relation who died does not arrive at the proper place, who eats that gift?
> Other kinsmen and blood relations who arrive at the proper place, they eat that gift.
> If, O Gotama, that kinsman or blood relation who died does not arrive at that place and the other kinsmen and blood relations who died do not arrive at the proper place, who eats that gift?
> This is a non-place, O Brahmin, it is impossible that that place would be long without deceased kinsmen and blood relations. Further, the giver is not without fruit.

The Buddha understood Jāṇussoṇi's concern about the lack of a recipient for his offering to indicate a fear that there would be no fruit for himself, as the giver; this notion is made more explicitly in *A* v.271, quoted below. His concern comes from the shared conception of merit derived from giving; I discuss this in greater detail in Chapter 5. Sufficient for our current discussion is the fact that the Buddha validates the *śrāddha* offerings, indicating that they are only effective for *petas*. While this is particularly relevant for those seeking clues of cultural history, as I am, this does not conclude the discussion.

The author has the Buddha continue to the real point of the *sutta*. The Buddha proceeds to redirect the conversation; he adapts the discussion of *śrāddha* to suit the Buddhist theology. After the Buddha says there can be no such case as an empty *peta visaya* Jāṇussoṇi pushes him to speculate:

> Aṭṭhānepi bhavaṃ gotamo parikappaṃ vadatīti?
> Aṭṭhānepi kho ahaṃ brāhmaṇa parikappaṃ vadāmi. *A* v.270
>
> In the case of no proper place, does Gotama make a supposition?
> As to no proper place, I do make a supposition.

Pushed to speculate on an impossible case, the Buddha then makes a similar list of people, their crimes, and their destinations, but adds the mitigating factor of good deeds they have done. An example:

> Idha brāhmaṇa ekacco pāṇātipātī hoti. Adinnādāyī hoti, kāmesu micchācārī hoti, musāvādī hoti, pisunāvāco hoti, pharusavāco hoti, samphappalāpī hoti, abhijjhālū hoti, vyāpannacitto hoti, micchādiṭṭhiko hoti, so dātā hoti, samaṇassa vā brāhmaṇassa vā annaṃ pānaṃ vatthaṃ yānaṃ mālāgandhavilepanaṃ, seyyāvasathapadīpeyyaṃ. So kāyassa bhedā paraṃ maraṇā hatthinaṃ sahavyataṃ upapajjati. So tattha lābhī hoti annassa pānassa mālā nānālaṅkārassa.
> Yaṃ kho brahmaṇa idha pāṇātipātī, adinnādāyī, kāmesu micchācārī, musāvādī, pisunavāco, pharusavāco, samphappalāpī, abhijjhālū, vyāpannacitto, micchādiṭṭhiko, tena so kāyassabhedā parammaraṇā hatthīnaṃ sahavyataṃ upapajjati. Yaṃ ca kho so dātā hoti samaṇassa vā brāhmaṇassa vā annaṃ pānaṃ vatthaṃ yānaṃ mālāgandhavilepanaṃ,
> seyyāvasathapadīpeyyaṃ, tena so tattha lābhī hoti annassa pānassa mālā nānālaṅkārassa. *A* v.271
>
> In this world when someone, O Brahmin, who is a destroyer of life, a thief, a misbehaver in sexual pleaser, a liar, a slanderer, one with rough speech, one who talks nonsense, covetous, malevolent, has a wrong view (heresy); but gave to samaṇas and Brahmins, food, water, clothes, vehicles, garlands of flowers, perfume, a bed, a home, and lamp oil, dies he is reborn in the company of elephants. There he gains a lot of food, water, garlands and various ornaments.
> Because he a destroyer of life, a thief, a misbehaver in sexual pleaser, a liar, a slanderer, one with rough speech, one who talks nonsense, covetous, malevolent, has a wrong view (heresy), he was reborn in the company of elephants. And because he gave to *samaṇas* and Brahmins, food, water, clothes, vehicles, garlands of flowers, perfume, a bed, a home, and lamp oil, he gains a lot of food, water, garlands and various ornaments.

The reward in the next life follows from the good deeds he did in this life. After a few more examples—horses, cattle, and poultry—he moves to the examples of those who lived virtuously and, thereby, are reborn as a human or god and gave gifts, and thereby received the five sensual pleasures, *kāmaguṇa*, human and divine respectively. He sums up his list by reiterating that the donor is not without fruit. Significantly, none of those who offset their immoral lives with religious giving end up in the world of *petas*. The moral seems clear: gifting insures you will not go to the world of the *petas* after death. In fact, the world of the *petas* would be empty if everyone engaged in the proper gifting to *samaṇas* and Brahmaṇas! As amazing as this section of the *sutta* is, the later half is more significant for my argument.

As is typical of Pāli Canon style, Jāṇussoṇi comments on how wonderful this is, but in his praise he interprets the Buddha's words affirming that it is proper to perform the *śrāddha* and the Buddha confirms this, as well as reiterating his placation of Jāṇussoṇi's fear that the gift will not be beneficial for him.

> Acchariyaṃ bho gotama, abbhūtaṃ bho gotama, yāvañc idaṃ bho gotama alameva dānāni dātuṃ, alaṃ saddhāni kātuṃ, yatrahi nāma dāyako pi anipphalo hoti.
> Evam etaṃ brāhmaṇa, evam etaṃ brāhmaṇa, dāyakopi hi brāhmaṇa anipphalo hoti. *A* v.273
>
> Wonderful, O Gotama, amazing, O Gotama, as far as this, O Gotama, it is proper to give gifts, it is proper to perform the *saddha*, where indeed the giver is not without fruit.
> This is so, Brahmin, this is so, Brahmin, the giver is not without fruit.

The *sutta* concludes with the formulaic conversion speech.

The significance of this passage for understanding the Buddhist reflection on *śrāddha* lies not in the Buddha's affirmation of the practice of *śrāddha*, nor in the subtle re-centering of religious practice on gifting, though both are important; rather it lies in the manner in which he innovates upon the tradition. The Buddha accepts the *śrāddha* as it

operates in the wider tradition as appropriate for a householder, but he then works to make its practice more relevant to his message. First he interprets Jāṇussoṇi's question broadly, shifting the question of whether the *śrāddha* really reaches one's ancestors to a discussion about the *ṭhāna*, literally place, of those who have departed and been reborn. That shift of topic drives the conversation to morality and the benefit of gifting. In this, the author of this *sutta* builds on the older Vedic model of sacrifice—through which one secures the material comforts in the next world—and effects a shift from the rather specific topic of giving to one's ancestors to gifting more generally. Emphasis on such a message was the impetus for the compilation of the *peta* stories, the *Petavatthu*.

The *Petavatthu*

Like the *Jānussoṇisutta*, the *Petavatthu* tells us a lot about the conception of the relationship between the living and the deceased, which is crucial for understanding the Buddhist conception of *śrāddha*. Additionally, the details that are missing from the *Jānussoṇisutta* illustrate associations between the Buddhist discourse on ancestor worship and Brahmanical proscriptions about the practice of *śrāddha*.

This concern over the welfare of the deceased—be he *peta*, from the Pāli, *preta*, from the Sanskrit, or a Pitṛ—another hallmark of *śrāddha*, is expressed loudly and clearly in the *Petavatthu*, the *Peta Stories*. Masefield tells us that the aim of both the *Petavatthu* and the *Vimānavatthu*, the *Mansion Stories,* is "stressing the urgent need to make merit and the means whereby such merit is to be generated" (Dhammapāla 1989, xix). The primary mode of making merit seen in these texts, in reality almost its sole concern, is almsgiving. While the context of most of the stories is generosity in general and giving to the Saṅgha in particular, the nature of the stories makes the connection to *śrāddha* most clear, especially when one considers them in relation to the *Jāṇussoṇisutta*.

Most of the *peta* stories describe the good and bad that a person did in their life, then describes the rewards and punishments they receive in the next life. Frequently the figure in the tale suffers some fate due to bad karma, but is rewarded for some good deed, or suffers due to some karma, but that suffering is mitigated by some act of charity. Masefield goes to great lengths to detail the possible combinations of the effects of bad karma and earning merit (Dhammapāla 1989, xxxv–xxviii). But, as we saw above in the *Jāṇussoṇisutta* (*A* v.271), the authors of the *Anguttara Nikāya* were already aware of the multiple factors which go into determining one's fate. Amidst these moral tales are gems that highlight the role that ancestor worship and ghost propitiation took in the Buddhist imagination.

The *Petavatthu* exists today imbedded in its commentary, the *Paramatthadīpanī nāma Petavatthu-aṭṭhakathā* of Dhammapāla. The *Petavatthu* is a collection of verses attributed to the Buddha, but each story exists, imbedded within the commentary, in three parts: 1. an introduction story that explains the context of the verses, 2. the verses, and 3. a commentary on the verses. Dhammapāla attributes the first two to the Buddha himself. The commentary is largely concerned with the meaning of the words in the verses and does not expound upon the underlying doctrine as much as a modern student of religion would hope (Dhammapāla 1980, viii). Due to the divided nature of the text I will address the verses by themselves, then address the larger, collective text.

The* śrāddha *for the Biscuit Doll

As in the *Anguttara Nikāya*, we have an example where the Buddha advocates ancestor propitiation. In a tale entitled *piṭṭhadhītalikapetavatthu*, "Ghost Story of the Biscuit Doll" (*Pv* 1.4) the Buddha enjoins one of his followers to give generously to those who have previously died.

yaṃ kiñ cārammaṇaṃ katvā dajjā dānaṃ amaccharī |
pubbapete ca ārabbha atha vā vathudevatā || 10
cattāro ca mahārāje lokapāle yasassino |
kuveraṃ dhataraṭṭhañ ca virūpakkhaṃ virūḷhakaṃ |
te ceva pūjitā honti dāyakā ca anipphalā || 11
na hi ruṇṇaṃ vā soko vā yā caccā paridevanā |
na taṃpetassa atthāya evaṃ tiṭṭanti ñātayo || 12
ayac ca kho dakkhiṇā dinnā saṅghamhi suppatiṭṭitā |
dīgharattaṃ hitāyassa ṭhānaso upakappatīti || *Pv* 1.4.10–13

10 With whatever concern the liberal one should give a gift to those previous deceased or also to the deities of the homestead;
11 And to the four great kings, the celebrated guardians of the world, Kuvera, Dhataraṭṭha, Virūpakkha, and Virūlhaka; with this forsooth they all are honored, and the Givers are not without reward.
12 No crying, no sorrow, no lamentation; that is not for the benefit of the deceased, even though his kinsmen persist.[248]
13 This gift is made, firmly established in the Saṅgha, will benefit them immediately for a long time. (Gehman)

The poet praises giving gifts to the *petas*, the deceased, and to the guardians of the world. He informs us that those who give are to be praised and they are not without reward. The last idea reiterates the Buddha's lesson from the *Anguttara Nikāya*. Further the poet is more explicit—and specific—about the recipient of the gift; it is to be the Saṅgha. In *A* v.271, the Buddha indicates that the gifts one gives that have an effect in the next life are to be given *samaṇassa vā brāhmaṇassa vā*, to Samaṇas or Brahmins. By the time of the composition of the *Petavatthu* the authors are most insistent about the Saṅgha being the primary target of giving.[249]

Further, the connection to the *śrāddha* is clear. The term *dāna* frequently indicates the gift given to an ancestor in the *śrāddha*. In the opening to the *Jāṇussoṇi Sutta* the

[248] Consider *Viṣṇu Smṛti* 20.30–31, which expresses a similar sentiment:

śocanto nopakurvanti mṛtasyeha janā yataḥ |
ato na roditavyaṃ hi kriyā kāryā sva-śaktitaḥ || 30
sukṛtaṃ duṣkṛttaṃ cobhau sahāyau yasya gacchataḥ |
bāndhavais tasya kiṃ kāryaṃ śocadbhir atha vā na vā || *VS* 20.30–31

[249] I discuss this in much more detail in Chapter 4.

author equates giving gifts, *dānāni dema*, with performing the *śrāddha*, *saddhāni karoma*. The author again asserts that giving and performing *śrāddha* are synonymous at the end of the *sutta* when Jāṇussoṇi says to the Buddha that doing so is proper, as seen above (*A* v.273).[250] The phrase *dāyakā ca anipphalā* would certainly remind an educated reader about the *Jāṇussoṇi Sutta*, which deals explicitly with *śrāddha*. The third verse addresses the concerns of a mourning family directly, indicating a context of death and its associated rituals, i.e., *śrāddha*. The term *dakkhinā*, Sanskrit *dakṣiṇā*, has a double resonance in this context. It would call to mind the efficacy of the ritual, which is ineffective without the *dakṣiṇā*, the sacrificial fee (Olivelle 1996, xliv). Additionally, it would bring to mind the soteriological import of the *dakṣiṇā*. According to *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 1.9.3.1 and 4.3.4.6, when the sacrifice goes to the world of the gods, the *dakṣiṇā* follows, with the sacrificer holding on.

Even if one were to argue that the verses predate the introductory prose,[251] the verses clearly refer to *śrāddha*, but the introductory material, which enhances this connection, gives us more insight into how the *śrāddha* was perceived.

We are told that the Buddha is staying in the Jeta Grove in Sāvatthī and that the tale concerns an instance of almsgiving (*dāna*) done by the householder Anāthapiṇḍika. The householder's young granddaughter was given a biscuit doll (*piṭṭhadhītalika*) by her nurse and she comes to look upon the doll as her own daughter; but one day, playing carelessly, she drops it and it breaks. She cries out, "My daughter is dead!" (*mama dhīta matā*) and none of the servants are able to console her.

[250] Most of the Hindu literature makes this same equation and in some texts, the verb *dā* or the noun *dāna* are more common than the term *śrāddha*.
[251] Horner points out that the introductory material is commentary, but then suggests that that does not necessarily mean it is much later. She fails to make a more definitive statement about the relationship of the prose introduction to the verses (Horner and Gehman 1974, iiix).

Now at this time the Buddha happened to be in the home of householder, who was seated right next to the Buddha. The nurse brought the girl into the presence of the householder, who promptly asked why the girl was crying. The nurse relayed the events and the householder took the girl into his lap and told her, “I will give alms on behalf of your daughter” (*tava dhītudānaṃ dassāmi*). He then turned to the Buddha and informed him he would be giving alms for his great-granddaughter, the biscuit doll, and invited him to attend. The Buddha consented with silence. When, the following day, they had finished their meal, the Buddha “spoke these verses expressing his appreciation” (*anumodanaṃ karonto*).[252] The similarity to the Hindu *śrāddha*, at which it is customary to recite certain texts, is striking; though, this could simply be a narrative device employed by the author of the prose to give a context for this verse.

Finally, at the last layer of the text, Dhammapāla gives us comments that indicate his understanding of this text. In his commentary on verse 10, he glosses the term *pubbapeta* with *pitaro*, ancestors. Dhammapāla, then, sees the *petas* not as a general class of deceased kinsmen and blood relations, but as ancestors. To complicate matter, however, he interprets this story to apply to giving more generally. Instead of reading the phrase *atha vā* in verse ten and a conjunction joining the *vathudevatā* in the list, he reads it as referring to giving more generally.

> atha vāti iminā accepi devamanussādike ye keci ārabbha dāna dadeyyāti dasseti | *PvA* 17
>
> *Or, moreover (atha vā)* indicates that they should give alms in this way with respect also to any other deva or man and so on whomsoever. (Kyaw)

[252] Masefield suggests, “It seems that following an almsgiving the recipient(s) would generally, before leaving, evoke such an emotion in the donor from the practice of almsgiving or simply expressing the wish that the results desired by the donor be attained.” He adds that the second possibility is supported by a later tradition which explicitly states so (1989, liv n45). On the other hand he says the same of the *peta*, giving examples: *Pv* 1.5.4 and *PvA* 81.

This reading clearly tells us more about Dhammapāla's theological agenda than about the grammar of the verses in question. The syntax suggests that the phrase aims to include the *vathudevatā*, nothing more.

Ghosts Outside the Walls

Another *peta* tale, "Petas Outside the Walls" (*Pv* 1.5), gives us much more detail and makes the Buddhist reflection on *śrāddha* clearer.

> tirokuṭṭesu tiṭṭhanti sandhisiṅghāṭakeṣu ca |
> dvārabāhāsu tiṭṭhanti āgantvāna sakaṃ gharaṃ || 14
> pahūte annapānamhi khajjabhojje upaṭṭhite |
> na tesaṃ koci sarati sattānaṃ kammapaccayā || 15
> evaṃ dadatni ñātīnaṃ ye honti anukampakā |
> suciṃ paṇītaṃ kālena kappiyaṃ pānbhojanaṃ || 16
> idaṃ vo ñātīnaṃ hotu sukhitā hontu ñātayo |
> te ca tattha samāgantvā ñātipetā samāgatā |
> pahūte annapānamhi sakkaccaṃ anumodare || 17
> ciraṃ jīvantu no ñātīyesaṃ hetu labhāmase |
> amhākacca katā pūjā dāyakā ca anipphalā || 18
> na hi tattha kasi atthi horakkhettha na vijjati |
> vaṇikkā tādisī natthi hiraccena kayākayaṃ |
> ito dannena yāpenti petā kālagatā tahiṃ || 19
> unnamed udakaṃ vuṭṭhaṃ yathā ninnaṃ pavattati |
> evam eva ito dinnaṃ petānaṃ upakappati || 20
> yathā vārivahā pūrā paripūrenti sāgaraṃ |
> evam eva ito dinnaṃ petānam upakappati || 21
> adāsi me akāsi me ñātimittā sakhā ca me |
> petānaṃ dakkhiṇaṃ dajjā pubbe katamanussaraṃ || 22
> ne hi ruṇṇaṃ vā soko vā yā caccā paridevanā |
> na taṃ petānamatthāya evaṃ tiṭṭhanti ñātayo || 23
> ayac ca kho dakkhiṇā dinnā saṅghamhi suppatiṭṭitā |
> dīgharattaṃ hitāyassa ṭhānaso upakappatīti || 24
> so ñātidhammo ca ayaṃ nidassito petāna pūjā ca katā ulāra |
> balacca bhikkhūnam anuppadinnaṃ tumhehi puccaṃ pahutaṃ anappakanti || *Pv* 1.5.14–25
>
> 1 They stand outside the walls and at the junctions and road-forks; they go to their own house and stand at the door-posts.
> 2 Though abundant food and drink, foods hard and soft, are served, on one remembers those creatures on account of their deeds.
> 3 So they who possess pity give for their relatives the purest, choicest, timely and

> fitting food and drink (saying) "Let this be for out relatives! May our relatives be happy!"
> 4 And those peta-relatives who have gathered and assembled there respectfully show their appreciation for the abundant food and drink (saying),
> 5 "A long life to our relatives by means of whom we have gained (all this) for honour has been paid to us and those who give are not without fruit!"
> 6 For there is no cultivation there, nor is there here any cattle-rearing known; nor are these such things as trading and buying and selling with gold—the petas, those who have passed on, are there sustained by what is given from here.
> 7 As water rained on the uplands flows down to the lowlands even so does what is given from her benefit the petas.
> 8 Just as swollen streams swell the ocean, even so does what is given from here benefit the petas.
> 9 "He gave to me, he worked for me, he was a relative, friend and companion to me"—(thus) recalling what they used to do one should give donations for the petas.
> 10 No amount of weeping, sorrow or any other lamentation benefits the peta though their relatives persist in them.
> 11 But this donation that has been made and firmly planted in the Saṅgha will serve, with immediate effect, their long term benefit.
> 12 Now this, the duty to one's relatives, has been pointed out and the highest honor has been paid to the petas; strength has been furnished to the monks and not trifling the meritorious deed pursued by you. (Kyaw)

This passage offers us some insight into the conception of *petas* and shows us that most often these *petas* are thought of as relatives, i.e., ancestors. In the first five verses a narrative unfolds revealing the identity of the *petas* as relatives. They are haunting the spots usually associated with ghosts, but significantly they haunt their own homes. Additionally, the *mantras* in verses 3 and 5 are reminiscent of key elements of the *śrāddha*. "Let this be for our relatives! May our relatives be happy!" reminds one of the *mantra* in the Gṛhyasūtras, "This *piṇda* is for you, those who follow you, and those whom you follow. To you *svadhā*!" (*GGS* 4.3.8). The *mantra* in verse 5 correlates to the brahmanical traditions view that one of the benefits of performing *śrāddha* stated in the Purāṇas is long-life (e.g., *MkP* 32.38). Verses 10 and 11 are identical to the end of the "Ghost Story of the Biscuit Doll," and evoke the same connections to *śrāddha* discussed in the previous section. The final verse invokes giving to the *petas* as the duty to one's

relatives, *ñātidhamma*. Performing the *śrāddha* belongs to a class of duties incumbent upon every householder; the Buddhist author simply employs this common conception of the householder life to argue for a Buddhist morality.

The introductory material contextualizes these highly suggestive verses, filling in the broader outlines of the story with considerable detail. Ninety-two eons ago, in a city named Kāsipurī, there was a king named Jayasena. His queen bore a son named Phussa who achieved enlightenment in that lifetime. His father, the king, became quite possessive, thinking, "My son it is who performed the Great Renunciation and has become a Buddha. Mine alone is the Buddha, mine the Dhamma, mine the Saṅgha" (*PvA* 19, Kyaw) and he alone attended upon the Buddha and the Saṅgha, denying all others access. Phussa's three brothers sought to attend upon him, and by earning a boon from their father, were granted three months to wait upon him. They chose to do so during the rain retreat and had a *vihāra* built and arrangements made. The princes' treasurer was a married householder of faith and devotion; he and his agent at the rain retreat organized the almsgiving with due care. Some officials at the retreat, however, were corrupt and obstructed the alms, stole some of the offerings for themselves, and set fire to the refectory. After the rain retreat was complete, the Buddha returned to the king's presence. Later the Buddha died, achieving *parinibbāna*.

In due time the princes, their treasurer, his agent and the corrupt officials in their employ died. The latter were all born together in heaven. The corrupt people were born into hell. Ninety-two eons passed as they enjoyed and suffered their fates respectively and during the time of Kassapa, the corrupt people were born among the petas. They witnessed others receiving alms from their relatives with the *mantra*—seen in verse 3 above—and asked Kassapa how they could attain such satisfaction. Kassapa informed them that they would not receive alms until a time in the future, during the life of the next

enlightened one, Gotama. He further informed them that the king Bimbisāra, who was their relative ninety-two eons ago, would give alms to the Buddha and dedicate it to them, whereby they would achieve satisfaction.

After one Buddha interval, during the time of Gotama Buddha, the three sons of the king, their agent, and their treasurer were reborn. The three princes renounced and became the three matted-hair ascetics of Gayāsīsa.[253] Their agent became king Bimbisāra; their treasurer became a wealthy merchant, Visākha; the remainder of their company became the king's entourage.

One day king Bimbisāra invited the Buddha to a meal; the Buddha accepted and came with Sakka, who was disguised as a Brahmin youth. The *petas* witnessed the meal and anticipated the king dedicating the alms to them, but the king was preoccupied with the arrangements for the Buddha and did not dedicate the meal. Distressed, the *petas* lost hope and that night moving about the king's residence wailing in distress. The king was afraid and went to the Buddha, relaying his fear and asking about a course of action. The Buddha allayed his fear and explained the situation. When the king asked the Buddha if such gifts would be received if given, the Buddha said they would. The king immediately issued a second invitation for that same day, promising to dedicate that meal to the *petas*.

At the meal the king offered water to the Buddha, dedicating it to the *petas*, and there arose for them lotus ponds covered with lotuses and blue lilies and their distress and thirst was alleviated. The king gave rice gruel and hard and soft foods; the *petas* received heavenly versions of the same and were refreshed (*piṇitindriyā*). Finally, the king gave

[253] Gayāsīsa refers to Gayāśīrṣa, a popular Hindu place of pilgrimage from early in the Common Era. It is interesting to note in this connection that the *śrāddha* has a particularly strong association with Gayā in later literature and that this tale, which I purport to describe a *śrāddha* involves the three ascetics that the Buddhist tradition frequently associates with Gayā (see Jacques 1962, 1979, 1980).

clothing and lodging; heavenly clothing and palaces appeared for the *petas*. The Buddha finished his meal and offered the verses in appreciation for the meal.

Most significant in this story, for its relationship to *śrāddha*, is the emphasis placed on the relationship of the *petas* who are forced to wait for satisfaction to the king who will eventually dedicate an offering to them. Kassapa informs them that they must await a relative of theirs who will be born in the time of the next Buddha, Gotama. They are punished in hell for eons, then reborn as *petas*. While the basis of this story differs from the brahmanical conception of the *preta* as a temporary stage between death and integration into the *pitṛloka*,[254] the reliance on relatives suggests this conception of alms for the dead derives from the older model of *śrāddha*. When the offending people are reborn as *petas*, in the time of Kassapa, they hear offerings made to relatives, *ñāti*, "Let this be for our relatives" (*idaṃ vo ñātīnaṃ hotu*), as in the verses. Kassapa informs them that they will, eventually, receive offerings from one who was a relative, *ñāti*, in the past. The connection between the giver, *dāyaka*, and the recipient remains a relationship between relatives; further supports the view that this form of almsgiving has its roots in the *śrāddha*. The Buddhists have broadened the application, making giving in general a moral duty, but they have failed to strip the paradigm of its original import and flavor, that of ancestor worship. That the *Petavatthu* aims to valorize giving more generally and that most examples are not as clearly connected to *śrāddha* model indicates the development of the religious tradition away from the original model, but the survival of these *śrāddha* motifs indicates the staying power of ancestor worship.

[254] Though Masefield makes a good effort to draw similarities that are here highlighted, "and whilst, in the Buddhist context, existence as a peta is, unlike the Brāhmaṇic preta-state, one not binding upon all beings, it is nonetheless, when seen as a post-mortem period during which the deceased is unable to attain the happiness characteristic of the next world, remarkably similar to the preta-state as a stage intermediately between death and subsequently joining the ancestors" (Dhammapāla 1989, xli).

One linguistic survival also supports this thesis. The king offered food to the Buddha, dedicating it to the *petas*, and they received heavenly food and "when they ate these their faculties were refreshed" (*te tāni paribhuñjitvā pīṇitindriyā ahesuṃ*).[255] The word *pīṇitindriya*, with senses refreshed, derives from the Sanskrit root √*prī*, to please, gladden, satisfy. In the Ābhyudayika *śrāddha*, as seen in the *Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhyasūtra*, the *mantra* "May the Nāndīmukha Pitṛs be satisfied" (*nāndīmukhāḥ pitaraḥ prīyantāṃ ŚGS* 4.4.12) is substituted for the *mantra* used in the *pārvaṇa śrāddha*.[256] *Āśvalāyana Gṛhyasūtra* 4.7.11 implores the funeral oblation, symbolized by the word *svadhā*, to satisfy the Pitṛs and these worlds, "By the *svadhā*, which satisfies the Pitṛs and these worlds for us" (*svadhayā pitṝn imāṃl lokān prīṇayā hi naḥ*).[257] This verb, used in the narrative description of the *petas* enjoying their offerings, echoes the *mantras* that enjoined the *śrāddha* offerings to satisfy the Pitṛs.[258]

The nature of the offerings too gives us insight into the degree to which they are modeled on the *śrāddha*. In this story the *petas* receive first water, then food, clothes, and a dwelling. The most basic offering made to the Pitṛs is water. The first offering made in the *Gobhila Gṛhyasūtra* is of water (*GGS* 4.3.6). In Manu a simple water offering can substitute for the usual ancestral ritual.

[255] I follow Masefield in reading *pīṇitindriyā* instead of *pi nindiyā* or *piṇindriyā*, who in turn follows the *PED* suggestion that this is a wrong reading, sv nindiya (Dhammapāla 1989, 34 n 25).

[256] The *mantra* replaced, *akṣayya*, imperishable, would certainly be less pleasing to the Buddhists who integrate the doctrine of rebirth into their ancestor worship much before the Brahmins do.

[257] *ĀśGS* 1.1.4 with respect to satisfying the gods with an oblation, *ĀśGS* 4.8.29 with respect to satisfying snakes in a propitiatory offering. The verb is also common in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, where it is more commonly associated with satisfying the gods in sacrifice. Among those, there is also some correspondence to achieving heaven as well. It is similarly employed in the *Mahābhārata*.

[258] The same root appears in *TB* 1.6.8.3, in the context is the *pitṛyajña* in the Sākamedha.

yadeva tarpayaty adbhiḥ pitṝn snātvā dvijottamaḥ |
tenaiva sarvam āpnoti pitṛyajñakriyāphalam || *MDhŚ* 3.283[259]

Even if a Brahmin simply satiates his ancestors with water after he has bathed, he obtains thereby the full reward of performing an ancestral rite (Olivelle).

The *piṇḍa* is literally made of food and serves as food for the Pitṛs; *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 2.4.2.2 indicates the monthly offering will be the Pitṛs' food. The Gṛhyasūtras enjoin the sacrificer to turn his back so the Pitṛs can eat in peace (e.g., *GGS* 4.3.11–12).

In the earliest ancestor worship clothing too is offered, at least symbolically, to the Pitṛs. *Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra* enjoins an offering of cloth (*BSS* 3.11). In *Gobhila Gṛhyasūtra* 4.3.24 the performer of the *śrāddha* places a linen thread in the *piṇḍa* of each of his three ancestors; the thread represents an offering of clothing.

The giving of houses offers an interesting reversal. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 2.4.2.24 instructs the sacrificer to ask the Pitṛs a house, since they are the guardians of houses.

gṛhā́n naḥ pitaró dattéti gṛhā́ṇāṃ ha pitára īśatá éṣo etásyāśī́ḥ kármaṇo *ŚB* 2.4.2.24

He mutters (*Vāj S* 2.32g), 'Give us a house, O fathers!' for the fathers are the guardians (*īśate*) of houses; and this is the prayer for blessing at this sacrificial performance (Eggeling).

This association survives in the Gṛhyasūtras—e.g., *GGS* 4.3.22–23, discussed above—and this connection survived in the Buddhist tradition. In *Pv* 1.4, the "Ghost Story of the Biscuit Doll," verse 10 enjoins making offerings to the *vatthudevatā*, the deities of the home. The verse could be read to mean that the *pubbapetas* are the *vathudevatās*.

yaṃ kiñ cārammaṇaṃ katvā dajjā dānaṃ amaccharī |
pubbapete ca ārabbha atha vā vathudevatā || *Pv* 1.4.10

With whatever concern the liberal one should give a gift to those previous deceased or also to the deities of the homestead; (Gehman)

[259] The observant reader will notice that Manu uses the term *pitṛyajña*, which by this time has a significantly different referent from the older ritual. For more on the changes in terminology, specifically *pitṛyajña* and *piṇḍapitṛyajña* in the context of the rise of *śrāddha*, see fns. 229 and 230. For more on Manu's use of the term *pitṛyajña* see the discussion of *MDhŚ* 3.1.22-123 on page 174 and especially fn. 243

Even if one does not accept this rather tenuous supposition, *petas* receiving houses and *pitṛs* giving houses does indicate some connection to the *śrāddha* for the authors of this *vatthu*.

While the order in which these items are given does suggest that the giving repeatedly demonstrated in the *Petavatthu* is modeled after the *śrāddha*, another fact more strongly indicates that *śrāddha* is at the heart of this literature—if not the concern with *petas* more generally. Offering food to the dead draws one's mind to ancestor worship without a doubt, but the fact that food offerings appear in a vast majority of the *peta* stories—whether they include such *śrāddha*-like elements as these two stories or not—indicates that the *śrāddha* model persisted in the Buddhist imagination. But food offerings are common, so this alone fails to convince. However, the triad of food, clothing, and housing appears in several stories, strongly reinforcing the impression that the offerings to the *petas* bear remarkable similarity to the *śrāddha* and suggesting that these *peta* offerings and the *śrāddha* share a single source, ancestor worship among the householders.

The preceding historical survey lays the foundation for the last two chapters of this dissertation, in which I argue that the appropriation of the role of mediator was a key factor in the transition that householder religion underwent in this period. The development of the *śrāddha* is instrumental to making clear the religious experts' efforts to construct their notion of householder in such a way as to secure for themselves the place of religious expert. The primary aspect of that role that concerns me in this work is the role of mediator, the intermediary between the householder and the supernatural entities they seek to propitiate through ritual, specifically the ancestors.

Chapter 3: Old Goals and New Concerns

This chapter aims to describe the motivations for the performance of ancestor worship evidenced in the earlier ritual and to outline the new concerns about the proper performance of the ritual that preoccupy the authors in the *dharma* literature. With respect to the former, the goals sought in the performance of these rites indicate two important aspects of ancestor worship in ancient India: 1. the increased importance the ancestral rites occupy in the emerging religious world and 2. the religious experts' efforts to associate the later form of ancestor worship, *śrāddha*, with all the benefits of the *śrauta* rites. Ancestor worship becomes more central to householder life and *śrāddha* becomes the locus for a synthesis of older independent theological threads. First, the many benefits of performing ritual are associated with ancestral rites and second, two disparate soteriological schemes are synthesized. In short, the importance of ancestor worship is magnified by drawing together older ideas and synthesizing them, making them stronger in the process.

A basic division in the types of texts dictates the structure of this chapter: ritual texts and *dharma* texts. The instructions found in ritual texts concern themselves with the performance of ritual and the *mantras* from those texts evidence the increased multivalent benefits of ancestor worship. The early *dharma* texts express two distinct visions of the heavens won through performance of *śrāddha*; one is eternal, while the duration of the stay in the other is determined by the kinds of oblations made in the *śrāddha*. In the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*, these views of the goals of *śrāddha* are synthesized—much as the *pañcamahāyajña* and '*huta* scheme' are in the same text—solidifying the position of the *śrāddha* as the premier ritual among the householder's obligations. Together the evidence from these texts outlines a fundamental shift in the perception of ancestor

worship in ancient India. Gradually, all the things desired by a householder and sought in ritual in general are associated specifically with the *śrāddha*. This affirms the practice of the ancestral rites, but also establishes the *śrāddha* as the rite by which one can win anything won through *śrauta* rituals.[260] The consolidation of the benefits of ancestor worship is seen most clearly in the Brahmanical material, thus this chapter deals primarily with those sources, but similar shifts are implied in the Buddhist material. In the end this chapter shows that the consolidation of the benefits of the ritual in the *śrāddha* is instrumental in the appropriation of Agni's role as a mediator between the ritualist and the supernatural entities he seeks to propitiate through ritual; this is the topic of Chapter 4.

AIMS OF ANCESTOR RITUALS IN THE VEDIC TEXTS

This section draws on the mythological context of ancestor worship in the Brahmaṇas to establish a trajectory for my discussion of the aims of ancestor worship. While I discuss both the *pitṛyajña* and the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*, I do not discuss them separately as before, because the aims and concerns surrounding the two rites are similar and frequently overlap.

The myths employed to introduce these rituals and the explanations inserted into the description of the ritual procedure illuminate the importance of ancestor worship in the minds of the Brahmin authors. Additionally, the *mantras* used in the ritual give us an insight into the sacrificer's aims. The rituals have several goals: feeding of the Pitṛs, improving the station of the Pitṛs, acquisition of material gain, and acquisition of non-material gain. Each of these themes is discussed in turn with an eye to understanding the

[260] This contributed to the increase in popularity of the *śrāddha* seen in the subsequent literature, i.e., the *Mahābhārata* and the Purāṇas, but I am most concerned with the early evidence of this shift.

gradual incorporation of all benefits sought in performing the *śrauta* rituals into the rituals of ancestor worship.

Feeding the Ancestors

Throughout its historical development the primary understanding of ancestor worship has been of feeding the ancestors; nowhere is this more clearly stated that in the Brāhmaṇas. *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 2.4.2—ancestor worship as a part of the full moon ritual—approaches the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* primarily as a rite dedicated to feeding the ancestors. In the mythic preamble to the ritual all living beings ask Prajāpati how they are to live. He informs each of them of the proper time for them to eat, their defining characteristic, and the source of their light. To the gods he says, *yajño vo 'nnam amṛtatvaṃ va ūrg vaḥ sūryo vo jyotir*, (*ŚB* 2.4.2.1) "Sacrifice is your food, (therefore) immortality is yours and strength is yours. The sun is your light." To the Pitṛs he says, *māsí māsi vó 'śanaṃ svadhā́ vo manojavasó vaś candrámā vo jyótir*, (*ŚB* 2.4.2.2) "Monthly is your eating, (therefore) *svadhā* is yours and quickness of thought is yours. The moon is your light." To men he says, *sāyám prātar vó 'śanam prajā́ vo mṛtyúr vo 'gnír vo jyótir*, (*ŚB* 2.4.2.3) "In the evening and the morning is your eating, (therefore) offspring is yours and mortality is yours. The fire (Agni) is your light."

The pattern, however, breaks down when the author turns to animals and *asuras*. About animals, the author only mentions they eat whenever they find food, in season or out. But, this does illuminate their character as well; they are scavengers. Their moral character then is also less rigid. The same can be said for the *asuras*: the *asuras* are defined by their *tamas*, darkness, and *māyā*, duplicity.

How each class of creatures lives, i.e., how they eat, reflects their character, and all other living creatures subsist (*upa*-√*jīv*) in the very manner Prajāpati laid down for them. Only men have transgressed Prajāpati's ordinance (*vrata*) and they have grown fat and

unrighteous as a result.[261] The author draws the connection between character and food most clearly:

> … manúṣyā eváiké 'tikrāmanti tásmād yó manuṣyā́ṇām médyaty áśubhe medyati vihū́rcati hi ná hy áyanāya caná bhávaty ánṛtaṃ hí kṛtvā́ médyati … *ŚB* 2.4.2.6
>
> … men alone transgress it. Therefore the man who grows fat grows fat in sin, because he waddles and is not even unable to walk because of his having grown fat by being false.

He who eats at the proper times, evening and morning, keeps Prajāpati's command and reaches the full measure of life and speaks the truth (*SB* 2.4.2.6). Keeping Prajāpati's ordinance with respect to eating properly reflects one's character, i.e., it is indicative of possessing *tejas,* brāhmanic luster.[262] While one could not go so far as to say that properly feeding the Pitṛs would demonstrates that one possesses *tejas* as well, but clearly there is a precedent set with regard to maintaining Prajāpati's ordinance. Performance of the ancestral rites is a part of the order created by Prajāpati; ancestor worship is ordained by the divine. The author places the obligation to undertake ritual feeding of one's ancestors on a cosmic level. The injunction to feed one's ancestors comes from the creator himself; it is a law of nature, the violation of which indicates a lack of character and threatens one's health.

The imperative to feed the Pitṛs appears in the discussion of the Sākamedha sacrifice as well.

> yám u cáivaibhyo devā́ bhāgám ákalpayaṃs tám u cáivaibhya eṣá etád bhāgáṃ karoti | *ŚB* 2.6.1.3
>
> And he makes for them (the Pitṛs) that share which the gods assigned to them.

[261] None of the other classes of being disobey Prajāpati's rule:

> naivá devā́ atikrā́manti | ná pitáro ná paśávo *ŚB* 2.4.2.6
>
> Neither gods, nor Pitṛs, nor beasts transgress (this ordinance).

[262] tád dhaitát téjo nā́ma brā́hmaṇaṃ yá etásya vratáṃ śaknóti cáritum *ŚB* 2.4.2.6

This occurs in a longer list of reasons for performing the *pitṛyajña*; significantly, however, it is the only reason seen in the context of both contexts of ancestor worship: the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* and the *pitṛyajña*. In short, the mythic introduction to the *śrāddha* reinforces the obligation to perform the ancestral rites, grounding them in the ordinances of Prajāpati and connecting the performance of the rites to the moral worth of the sacrifice.

Beyond the most basic relationship established by food, the soteriological import of ancestor worship also lent to the imperative to perform these rites. In addition to the sustaining of one's ancestors in heaven, there was the possibility of bettering their situation in the afterlife.

Improving the Station of the Pitṛs

The Pitṛs benefit from their descendants' performance of ancestor worship in another way: their position in the next world improves. The mythic introduction to the *pitṛyajña* as part of the Sākamedha of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* offers one explanation of the origin of the sacrifice and the reason for its performance.

> mahāhaviṣā́ ha vái devā́ vṛtrám̐ jaghnuḥ | téno evá vyájayanta yéyam eṣā́m̐ víjitistām átha yā́n eváiṣām̐ tásmint saṃgrāmé 'ghnaṃs tā́n pitṛyajñéna sámairayanta pitáro vái tá āsaṃs tásmāt pitṛyajñó nā́ma || 1 || tád vasantó grīṣmó varṣā́ḥ | eté té yé vyájayanta śaráddhemantaḥ śíśirastá u té yā́n púnaḥ samáirayanta || 2 || átha yád eṣá eténa yájate | tán nā́ha nv èváitásya táthā kám̐ cana ghnantī́ti devā́ akurvann íti nv èváiṣá etát karoti yám u caiváibhyo devā́ bhāgám ákalpayaṃs tám u caiváibhya eṣá etád bhāgám̐ karoti yā́n u caivá devā́ḥ samáirayanta tā́n u caiváitád avati svā́n u caivàitát pitṝ́m̐ créyāṃsa lokám upónnayati yád u caivā̀syā́trātmanó 'caraṇena hanyáte vā mīyáte vā tád u caivā̀syaiténa púnar ā́pyāyate tásmād vā́ eṣá eténa yajate || 3 || *ŚB* 2.6.1.1–3

> 1 By means of the great *havis* the gods slew Vṛtra. Thereby they won that victory which is theirs. (The gods) made those whom they[263] killed in that battle of theirs arise by means of the *pitṛyajña*. Now, they were the Pitṛs, therefore it is called the *pitṛyajña*. 2 Spring, summer, and the rainy season: these are the ones who won. Autumn, the winter, and the cool season indeed were the ones who they made arise.[264] 3 When he performs this sacrifice, he performs it so that they do not kill any of his and because the gods performed (it). And he makes for them (the Pitṛs) that share which the gods assigned to them. And those whom the gods made arise, he impels them. And he leads his own Pitṛs to a better world. Whatever in this (ritual) is smashed or diminished because of his own action, that is restored by this (*pitṛyajña*). This is why one performs this sacrifice.

Among the many purposes here ascribed to the ritual, one indicates the sacrificer will advance his Pitṛs to a better world by performing the *pitṛyajña*. The sacrificer reenacts the gods' action of reanimating the dead, but the sacrificer is not reanimating those killed in battle, but reanimating his father in a better world, the world of the fathers.[265] Despite the language that suggests a movement to a better world, as the details of the ritual reveal this rite sustains the Pitṛs in heaven. He ensures that they achieve and retain the best of the next world.

These aims have benefited the ancestors, but the sacrifice was not without benefit himself. In fact, there is an increased association of the ancestral rites with a fuller spectrum of the benefits sought by performing ritual more generally. From the oldest descriptions—those just discussed and those from the *saṃhitā* literature seen in Chapter 2—the ritual is primarily about taking care of the ancestors' needs, i.e., ritually transforming them from dead relative to ancestor. The following section shows that

[263] Eggeling follows Sāyaṇa—who provides the subject for the subordinate clause in line 1 above: *yān evāsura agnan amārayan* (Weber 1964, 217)—taking this to refer to those killed in battle by the Asuras, but the parallels with the final line suggest that those killed in the conflict were killed by the gods, perhaps those killed as collateral damage in the main fights, since Vṛtra is certainly not raised again.
[264] The gods and the fathers are identified with their respective seasons in *ŚB* 2.1.3.1 also, in the context of determining the appropriate season for the establishment of the sacred fires.
[265] It may be interesting to note here that this distinguishes the rite from the *pitṛyajña* of the *Ṛg Veda*, since that rite is performed after the deceased has attained the status of Pitṛ and is honored as such with oblations.

gradually the ancestral rites are associated with all benefits available through ritual for the sacrificer. For convenience sake the benefits are divided into material benefits and non-material benefits.

Acquisition of Material Benefits

Two common objects won by performing this sacrifice are: progeny, specifically sons, and wealth.

Sons

Sons seem to be especially associated with the ancestor worship throughout its entire history. The *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* makes this clear near the end of the *piṇḍapitṛyajña*.

> vīrám̐ vā vái pitáraḥ prayánto háranti | vīrám̐ vā dadati | daśā́m̐ chinatti | háraṇabhāgā hí pitáraḥ | pitṝ́n evá nirávadayate íti | úttara ā́yuṣi lóma chindīta | pitṝṇā́m̐ hy etarhi nédīyaḥ *TB* 1.3.10.7
>
> The Pitṛs, passing away, take a son; or give a son. He cuts his hem—since the Pitṛs share is taking away—he give the Pitṛs (their share). If he is older a hair is cut, for then he is nearer to the Pitṛs.

Despite the Pitṛs power to give or take sons, through proper propitiation they give sons. If one fails to make the proper offering, they will take sons. The sacrificer offers a piece of his hem to the Pitṛs as their share, or, if older, hair from his chest. Sāyaṇa's comments on this section will illuminate the significance of this rite.

> pakṣadvayam api saṃbhāvyate | vaikalye putraṃ mārayanti | sākalye putraṃ prayacchanti atra vaikalyasya duṣpariharatvāt putrapratyāmnāyatvena vastrāgram īṣat sūtraṃ chitvā piṇḍeṣu nidadhyāt |
>
> Two theses are possible. When the ritual is imperfect they (the Pitṛs) kill the son. In the ritual is perfect they give a son; in this since it is difficult to avoid the imperfect, the son should, in accordance with the scriptural statements, should deposit the thread from the tip of his garment on the *piṇḍa*, having cut it slightly.

Through the proper allocation of the Pitṛs' share, the hair-offering made on the *piṇḍas*, the Pitṛs are propitiated and the sacrificer wins a son. He thus avoids the Pitṛs taking his son away with them when they leave the ritual.[266]

Additionally, wishes for sons often find expression in the *mantras* recited at the ancestral rites, invoking the Pitṛs to give progeny. The preeminent gift is sons. The term *vīra* here refers to heroic sons.

> tváyā hí naḥ pitáraḥ soma pū́rva kármāṇi cakrúḥ pavamāna dhī́rāḥ |
> vanvánn ávātaḥ paridhī́ṃr ápo ''rṇu vīrébhir áśvair maghávā bhava ||[267] *TS* 2.6.12.1
>
> With you, O Soma Pavamāna, our wise Pitṛs performed the rites;
> You, untroubled and conquering, open the enclosures; be generous to us in sons and horses.

In other *mantras* used in the *pitṛyajña*, the call for sons is more exclusive.

> idáṃ havíḥ prajánanaṃ me astu dáśavīraṃ sárvagaṇaṃ svastáye |
> ātmasáni prajāsáni paśusáni lokasáni abhayasáni |
> agníḥ prajā́ṃ bahulā́ṃ me karotu ánnaṃ páyo réto asmā́su dhatta || *VS* 19.48
>
> May this oblation be procreation for me for the good fortune of a full company of ten sons; (may it be) self-winning, offspring-winning, beast-winning, world-winning, and security-winning. May Agni make my offspring many; confer on us food, milk, and semen.

The oblation itself is procreation; through it the sacrificer will gain ten sons; it is specifically said to be *prajāsáni*, offspring-winning. Through the *pitṛyajña* he will bestow sons upon the sacrificer.

The *Vājaseneyi Saṃhitā* records another *mantra* that expresses this desire.[268]

> ādhatta pitaro garbhaṃ kúmāraṃ puṣkarásrajam | yathehá puruṣó 'sat || *VS* 2.33[269]

[266] Sāyaṇa begins the section quoted above with,

> piṇḍarūpam annaṃ bhuktvā yadā pitaraḥ svasthāne prayānti tadānīm asya vīraṃ putraṃ vidyamānam apaharanti vā 'vidyamānaṃ dadati vā |

[267] *ṚV* 9.96.11; *VS* 19.43

[268] The wish for sons is also expressed in *VS* 19.59, which is seen below in another connection.

[269] *ṚV* 10.137.5

> May the father bestow upon me a child, a son garlanded in lotuses, so that there will be a man here.

The centrality and frequency of the *mantras* that mention progeny highlight the significance of this connection between ancestor worship and gaining sons. This association is only strengthened in the later tradition. Beyond a hope for sons the ritualist hopes for increased wealth.

Wealth

In the *mantras* that express the desire to win wealth through the *pitṛyajña* the importation of the benefits derived from *śrauta* rites more generally begins to become clear, since the primary association of the ancestral rites, as shown above, is feeding and progeny. *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* 2.6.12 records the verses to be sung by the Hotṛ during the *pitṛyajña*. In *TS* 2.6.12.1–2 we have the verse recited during the Puronuvākya, which calls upon the Pitṛs to grant the sacrificer many things. In verse one, seen above, the Pitṛs are implored to grant horses, a sign of wealth. Further, they ask for wealth more directly:

> tváṃ soma pitṛ́bhiḥ saṃvidhānó 'nu dyā́vāpṛthivī́ ā́ tatantha |
> tásmai ta indo havíshā vidhema vayáṃ syāma pátayo rayīṇā́ṃ ||[270]
> ágniṣvāttāḥ pitara é 'há gachata sádaḥsadaḥ sadata supraṇītayaḥ |
> attā́ havī́ṃṣi práyatāni barhíṣy áthā rayíṃ sárvavīraṃ dadhātana ||[271]
> bárhiṣadaḥ pitara ūtỳ arvā́g imā́ vo havyā́ cakṛmā juṣádhvam |
> tá ā́ gatā́ 'vasā śáṃtamenā́ 'thā 'smábhyam śáṃ yór arapó dadhāta ||[272] *TS* 2.6.12.2
>
> You, O Soma associated with the Pitṛs, have stretched over sky and earth;
> Let us offer to you for him with the oblation; let us be lords of wealth.
> Come here, O Agniṣvātta Pitṛs, sit in each seat, O you of good guidance;
> Eat the oblation spread out on the *barhis* and give us wealth with many heroes.
> O Barhiṣad Pitṛs come hither with your aid; we have made these offerings for you; be pleased,
> Food comes to you most auspiciously (We come to you by your most auspicious aid); give us welfare, health, and safety!

[270] *ṚV* 8.48.13; *VS* 19.54
[271] *ṚV* 10.15.11; *VS* 19.59
[272] *ṚV* 10.15.4; *VS* 19.55

The first verse asks the Pitṛs to let the sacrificers be "lords of wealth." This sentiment is repeated in *Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā* 19.61, using the same phrase. In *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 2.4.2.24 the Hotṛ recites the following *mantra*, *gṛhān náḥ pitaro data,* "Give us a house, O Pitṛs," seeking another form of wealth, a house. Additionally, the request for houses may also point to a more intangible gift, safety and security. These more abstract notions of improving one's life find a significant place in the benefit sought through the performance of ancestral rites.

Acquisition of Non-material Benefits

The myriad of non-material benefits sought through ritual can be classed, for convenience sake alone, into three types: long life, general well being in this world, and heaven in the next.

Long Life

The gift of a full life—defined as one hundred years—is expressed in two separate *mantras*. In *VS* 19.37–38, the sacrificer asks his Pitṛs to purify him so that he may live a full life.

> punántu mā pitáraḥ somyā́saḥ punántu mā pitāmahā́ḥ |
> punántu prápitāmahāḥ pavítreṇa śatā́yuṣā |
> punántu mā pitāmahā́ḥ somyā́saḥ punántu prápitāmahāḥ |
> pavitreṇa śatā́yuṣā víśvam ā́yur vy áśnavai || 37
> ágna ā́yūṃṣi pavasva ā́ suvórjam íṣaṃ ca naḥ |
> āré bādhasva ducchúnā ||[273] *VS* 19.38
>
> 37 May my father, who enjoys Soma, purify me; may my grandfather purify me. May my great-grandfather purify (me) with the filter that brings a life of one hundred years.[274] May my grandfather, who enjoys Soma, purify (me); may my great-grandfather purify (me) with the filter that brings a life of one hundred years

[273] *ṚV* 9.66.19

[274] About this term Keith says, "A jar of Sura pierced with a hundred holes is hung over the Southern fire-place, and a sieve of strainer made of hair of horse, cow, goat, and wool, with gold, is placed beneath. As the liquor drops thereon the Sacrificer recites texts for his purification" (quoted in Pratap 1990, 306).

so that (I) obtain a full life.
38 O Agni, purify our lives and our *suvorja* and strength.

The author associates the filter used to strain the *surā* with a life of one hundred years and the sacrificer invokes the Pitṛs to purify him, just as he purifies the *surā*. *VS* 19.46 also invokes the Pitṛs to grant a long life here in this world.

yé samānā́ḥ sámanaso jīvā́ jīvéṣu māmakā́ḥ |
téṣāṃ ṣrī́r máyi kalpatām asmíṃ loké śatáṃ sámāḥ || *VS* 19.46

Those of mine, the living among the living, who are equal, unanimous:
May I share in their splendor for a hundred years in this world.

The sacrificer not only wants a share of the splendor of those who live, but wants to do so for a full life time, one hundred years. The emphasis here is on the duration of the gift, a full lifetime, not the gift itself.

Protection and Well-Being in This World

The hope that the Pitṛs will protect the sacrificer in return for being fed appears in many places. This protection falls into two categories: health or safety and protection from danger that immoral behavior brings. The first accords with the general notion that one's ancestors have a vested interest in the continuation of their line. The second relates to the sacrificer's call for a moral guardian, one who will shield the sacrificer from the deleterious actions he has committed.

Several of the passages we have read so far factor into the general sense of well being that should characterize a fulfilled life. *TS* 2.6.12 calls on the Barhiṣad Pitṛs for welfare, health and safety. The verse makes explicit the notion of exchange, "Food comes to you most auspiciously; give us welfare, health, and safety!"[275] In the preamble to the *pitṛyajña* of the Sākamedha in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, the author lists reasons for

[275] See above for Sanskrit text.

performing the ritual. The first on the list indicates the reason involves protecting the sacrificer's family.

> átha yád eṣá eténa yájate | tán nā́ha nv èvàitásya táthā káṃ cana ghnanti *ŚB* 2.6.1.3
>
> When he performs this sacrifice, he performs it so that they do not kill any of his.

Sāyaṇa indicates that it is the asuras who threaten the sacrificer's kin, but the subject of √*han* is ambiguous.[276] No matter the specific fear that engendered this verse, the sense of security won through this sacrifice is clear. The sacrifice is intended to protect the sacrifice from whatever harm may befall him.

In the *Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā*, the sacrificer calls upon the Pitṛs to show their favor on him.

> úd īratām ávara út párāsa ún madhyamā́ḥ pitáraḥ somyā́saḥ |
> ásuṃ yá īyúr avṛkā́ ṛtajñā́s té no 'vantu pitáro háveṣu ||[277] *VS* 19.49
>
> May they arise the low, the high, and the middle Pitṛs worthy of Soma.
> Let the Pitṛs, the knowers of *ṛta* who safely went to a life, favor us at our invocations.
>
> úpahūtāḥ pitáraḥ somyā́so barhiṣyèṣu nidhéṣu priyéṣu |
> tá ā́ gamantu tá ihá śruvantv ádhi bruvantu tè 'vantv asmā́n || 57
> ā́ yantu naḥ pitáraḥ somyā́so 'gniṣvāttā́ḥ pathíbhir devayā́naiḥ |
> asmín yajñé svadháyā́ mádantó 'dhi bruvantu tè 'vantu asmā́n || *VS* 19.57–58
>
> 57 May the Soma worthy Pitṛs who were invited to the dear offerings on the *barhis* come; may they here hear; may they intercede on our behalf, may they favor us.
> 58 May the Soma-worthy Agniṣvātta Pitṛs come by the path of the gods; enjoying themselves at our sacrifice by the *svadhā*, may they intercede on our behalf, may they favor us.

The verbal root √*av* means to help, but the mode and cause of that help is varied. The help sought can range from simply respecting or being pleased with, to guarding,

[276] Cf. fn. 263.
[277] *ṚV* 10.15.1

defending or protecting. This word implies all sorts of help; in short the sense of well-being that the sacrificer seeks from the Pitṛs.

That sense of well-being depends not only upon the Pitṛs, but also upon the sacrificer's behavior. A *mantra* in the *Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā* implores the Pitṛs to refrain from hurting the sacrificer for his transgressions.

> mā́ hiṃsiṣṭa pitaraḥ kéna cin no yád va ā́gaḥ puruṣátā kárāma | *VS* 19.62
>
> Do not hurt us, O Pitṛs, on account of whichever transgression we may have committed because of the nature of being human.

Since both appear in the context of ancestor worship, this passage may be connected with *ŚB* 2.4.2.6, seen above, in which men were the only beings to fail to keep Prajāpati's ordinance about eating. Elsewhere, the Pitṛs are asked not only to avoid punishing the sacrificer for our failings, but to restore what was lost. In the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* the sacrificer seeks redemption.

> yád u caivā́syā́trātmanó 'caraṇena hanyáte vā mīyáte vā tád u caivā́syaiténa punar ā́pyāyate *ŚB* 2.6.1.3
>
> Whatever of his which is smote or diminished because of his own bad behavior, that is restored by this (sacrifice).

This is mentioned in the context of defining the purpose of the *pitṛyajña*, thus it has a place of prominence in the minds of the authors with regard to the intention of performing ancestor worship.

Heaven

Another benefit, which in later years is to have a profound hold on the intention for performing the *śrāddha*, is the acquisition of heaven. In the *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā* the author refers to the battle against Vṛtra and indicates that the ritual is to gain immortality in heaven.

prajā́ḥ sṛṣṭvā́nho ‘vayájya vṛtrā́ṃ hatvā́ devā́ amṛtatvā́ṃ evā́kāmayanta, svargó vái lokò ‘mṛtatvā́ṃ, saṃvatsarā́ḥ svargó lokó, yád dvā́daśā́hutayo ‘mṛtatvā́m evá téna spṛṇoty … *MS* 1.10.17

Having created creatures, having gotten rid of danger by sacrifice, and having slain Vṛtra, the gods desired immortality. The world of heaven is immortality. The year is the world of heaven. When one (performs) the twelve oblations, by that he gains immortality.[278]

The author connects the *pitṛyajña* to the gods acquisition of immorality. By performing the *pitṛyajña*, men too can attain heaven, which is immortality. The continued performance of this ritual will grant the Pitṛs immortal life in heaven. The twelve oblations are the many parts of the *pitṛyajña* ritual.[279] This is reinforced by several passages which refer to the year, *saṃvatsara*, in the other Brahmanical descriptions of the *pitṛyajña*. The *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, for example, says:

… sómāya pitṛmáte puroḍā́śaṃ ṣā́ṭkapālaṃ nírvapati | saṃvatsaró vái sómaḥ pitṛmā́n (2) | *TB* 1.6.8.2

He makes the oblation for the Soma connected to the Pitṛs in six cups, for the Soma connected to the Pitṛs is the complete year.

In this section the author equates Pitṛmat Soma with the whole year, *saṃvatsara*, the Barhiṣad Pitṛs with the months (*mā́sā vái pitáro barhiṣádaḥ TB* 1.6.8.3), Agniṣvātta Pitṛs with the half months (*ardhamāsā́ vái pitáro ‘gniṣvātā́ḥ TB* .6.8.3). The association, however, is complicated by *TB* 1.4.10.1, which makes the following connections:

agnír vā́vá saṃvatsarā́ḥ | ādityā́ḥ parivatsarā́ḥ | candrámā idāvatsarā́ḥ | vāyúr anuvatsarā́ḥ iti | yád vaiśvadevéna yájate | agním evá tát saṃvatsarā́m āpnoti | támsād vaiśvadevéna yájamānaḥ | saṃvatsarī́ṇāṃ svastím ā́śāsta ity ā́śāsīta | … *TB* 1.4.10.1

The fire is the first year. The Sun is the second year. The Moon is the third year. The Wind is the fourth year. When one sacrifices with the Vaiśvadeva, he obtains the fire, i.e., the year. Therefore, the Sacrificer, (should sacrifice) along with the

278 Bhide indicates that this passage also occurs at *KS* 36.11 (Bhide 1979, 95).

279 Bhide identifies the twelve parts as: four Prayājas, two Ājyabhāgas, three principal offerings, one Sviṣṭakṛt offering, and two Anūyāja offerings (Bhide 1979, 95).

> Vaiśvadeva. That he desires well-being for those who have the year: that is desired.

The pattern continues with each of the divinities identifies in the first few sentences. In short, the year is a trope that reinforces the notion of completion. Thite's analysis of sacrifice in the Brāhmaṇas suggests that the "possibility of 'year-gaining'" is simply one of many strategies to "elevate" the particular ritual (Thite 1975, 42). There are several such strategies, each of which is employed, in Thite's view, to escalate the value of the particular ritual dealt with at the moment.

A similar effort to escalate the value of ancestor worship is evident in this review. The *śrauta* rites offered many benefits to the sacrificer and those benefits appear to multiply for each rite (Thite 1975, 54 and passim). While the trend of increased multivalent benefit arising from ritual performance occurred across the ritual spectrum, the trend is augmented in the realm of ancestor worship by two other factors: the increasing importance of ancestral offerings and the eclipsing of the *śrauta* ritual model by the *gṛhya* ritual model.[280] The performance of the ancestral rites was affirmed by an increased association with all the benefits won through the performance of *śrauta* rituals. In no small way, the *śrāddha* inherited the import of the older Vedic model of sacrifice, through, among other things, its inclusion in the theologies discussed in Chapter 1 and the perceived continuity with the older models of ancestor worship.[281]

Alongside this perceived continuity is a shift in the concerns expressed in the texts over the performance of ancestor worship.

[280] The former is made clear in my discussion of the amount of space dedicated to the *pitṛyajña* as one of the *mahāpañcayajñas* in the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*, p. 173, and in my discussion of the same trend in the lists of Brahmins eligible to be invited to the *śrāddha*, p. 230f. The latter is evidence by the composition of the Gṛhyasūtras themselves—which indicates an increased importance, see Gonda 1977b, 547 and Oldenberg 1967, xv–xxii —and the form of ritual most often described in the subsequent tradition, i.e., *gṛhya*.
[281] The terminological manifestations of this continuity are examined in Chapter 2.

NEW CONCERNS ABOUT ANCESTOR RITUALS IN THE *DHARMA* LITERATURE

The *dharmasūtrakāras* inherit two soteriological aims: an eternal heaven and *mokṣa*, liberation from *saṃsāra*.[282] Before moving to examine these concerns, it is necessary to briefly address the social and religious changes that contribute to the shift in emphasis found in the *dharma* literature. Renunciation arose as an alternative to the householder life.[283] The first evidence we have of the householder's response to the ideal of renunciation occurs in the Dharmasūtras. An soteriology that posits a perpetual reincarnation, and the concomitant proposition that all births are temporary, arises out of the renunciation ideology; that notion is in conflict with the older soteriological assumptions of the Vedic tradition, which presuppose an eternal stay in heaven achieved through ritual.[284] The Brahmins who advocate the householder lifestyle respond to the criticism of a permanent stay in heaven raised by the acceptance of the ideology of reincarnation, i.e., if the *ātman* is reincarnated in a new body after death, how do the ancestors abide in heaven and receive the oblations made in the *śrāddha*?[285] The ideology

[282] Cf. fn. 1.

[283] I refrain from asserting a chronological distance between the Gṛhyasūtras and the *dharma* literature, though one certainly existed, to account for the absence of any renunciate ideologies, because the chronology is extremely vague. More importantly, the concerns of the Gṛhyasūtras and the Śrautasūtras, the latter of which certainly postdated the most significant Upaniṣads, preclude any expression of the renunciate and concomitant ideas about reincarnation; their concern is the ritual. Thus it is not entirely surprising that no hint of reincarnation appeared in the Gṛhyasūtras of Śrautasūtras.

[284] The tension between these two soteriologies is, or course, much more complex than is stated here, but space does not allow for a fuller treatment here.

[285] This question is raised explicitly in the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*:

> kathaṃ ca śaktās te dātuṃ narakasthāḥ phalaṃ punaḥ | *BrP* 2.9.10cd
>
> How are they able to be given the benefits (of *śrāddha*) if they reside in hell?

The narrative to which this introductory question refers answers the question in full:

of *mokṣa* and freedom from rebirth threaten the centrality of the ritual life, of the householder life, and this contestation is one of the central issues in the householder-renouncer debate that shapes the formation of Hinduism.

By the time of the Dharmasūtras, the debate over the two soteriological goals, heaven and *mokṣa*, rages.[286] Both these ideologies find expression in the Dharmasūtras, but the authors clearly come down on the side of the householder.[287] The *śrāddha* is constructed as *the* ritual for attaining heaven, for oneself as well as for one's ancestors.

nānārūpāsu jāyante tiryagyoniṣv ayoniṣu |
yadāhārā bhavanty ete tāsu tāsv iha yoniṣu || 88
tasmiṃs tasmiṃs tadāhāre śrāddhaṃ dattaṃ pratiṣṭhate |
kāle nyāyāgataṃ pātre vidhinā pratipāditam || 89
prāpnoty annaṃ yathādattaṃ jantur yatrāvatiṣṭhate |
yathā goṣu pranaṣṭāsu vatso vindati mātaram || 90
tathā śrāddheṣu dattānnaṃ mantraḥ prāpayate pitṝn |
evaṃ hy aviphalaṃ śrāddhaṃ sraddhādattaṃ tu mantrataḥ || *BrP* 1.28.88–91
88 They are born in (wombs) of various forms, the wombs of animals, or not in wombs.
What food belongs to those in various births [lit. womb],
89 The *śrāddha*-given (food) goes forth to each one that has that as its food,
Which, given rightly, comes at the (proper) time in the dish, according to the rules.
90 A creature obtains the food given in this way where it abides,
as, when the cows have disappeared, the calf finds its mother.
91 Likewise, the *mantra* causes the Pitṛs to obtain the food given in *śrāddha*.
Thus, on account of the *mantra*, the *śrāddha* given with confidence, is not without benefit.

This question is also expressed at *BrP* 2.20.12–15 and *GP* 2.10.20.
The authors of the Purāṇas acknowledge the tension between the heaven won through *śrāddha* and the notion of *mokṣa*, but the effort to synthesize these soteriologies—frequently by reducing heaven to one more stop on the long journey of transmigration of the soul to ultimate emancipation from *saṃsāra*in *mokṣa*—absent in the texts of the present study abound in the Purāṇas. See *BrP* 2.11.14–15; 2.13.2; *GP* 86.13–18.
Saindon has addressed related issues in the Epic literature (Saindon 1999).
It is interesting that the concern over intersection of rebirth and *śrāddha* offerings appears to be completely altruistic. That is to say, I was unable to find a single instance of the reverse of this question, i.e., how do the Pitṛs bestow their beneficence on me if they are in another birth; the concern seems to be exclusively that the Pitṛs receive their food. One could speculate, while Jānussoṇi hopes see p. 177, that the benefit of giving the *śrāddha* is earned simply by offering.

[286] Though it is interesting to point out that the two soteriological systems coexist within the Dharmasūtras without ever intersecting. This mode of integrating different system with no overt synthesis is quite common in the history of Hinduism, and though the Purāṇas do this as well, they also employ different modes of synthesis and modification. The result of this multitude of voices makes the puranic reflections on *śrāddha* particularly interesting.

[287] *ĀpDhS* 2.23.3–12 is a good example of this debate.

Previously heaven was the goal of many different rituals, but as the appeal of Vedic ritual declined, they did not endure. The *śrāddha* ritual, I suggest, has been invested with many of the benefits sought in the *śrauta* ritual and thereby bridges the gap between the *śrauta* and *gṛhya* rituals, and partly because of that, survives into the later tradition. The ideology of the three debts is one householder answer to the ascetics' assertion that heaven is not the ultimate goal and that ritual is inadequate to the ultimate aim. Further, the integration of the *śrāddha* into the three debts ideology, too, gave it a prominent place in the minds of those Brahmins who created the newer model of religiosity whose origins begin in the *dharma* literature and matures in the Purāṇas.

In the earliest literature a permanent stay is in heaven is assured, but in subsequent genres concerns over the Pitṛs remaining in the *pitṛloka* are rampant. Slowly the confidence in the permanency of heaven erodes. Unlike the earlier literature, which assumes that the stay in heaven is a permanent one, the authors of the Dharmasūtras advance an array of oblations that sustain the Pitṛs for a variety of durations. From the tacit admission that the older model of the ritual fails to achieve an eternal heaven for their ancestors, the ritualist moves to recreate the array of offerings to include offerings that do win an eternal stay in heaven.

A tension arises in the discussions about the durability of the offerings made to the Pitṛs, a tension between an eternal stay in heaven and an acceptance that not all offerings offer inexhaustible benefits. No one Dharmasūtras engages both of these positions; two authors address the ritual with an eternal stay in heaven as its end, the other two accept the position that not all offerings guarantee a permanent heaven. In the older model—seen in the *mantras* of the older ritual texts—heaven is eternal and the food will sustain

them in heaven for eternity.[288] Forging the newer model, the authors of some *dharma* texts assert that same state—the eternality of heaven—by admitting that some offerings are not eternal, but that they know those offerings that will indeed grant eternal satisfaction.[289] Manu, however, synthesizes the two views, choosing to advocate an eternal stay in heaven and one the duration of which is determined by the material of one's offering. This trajectory is central to the consolidation of the householder's range of ritual needs. This section explicated the two older independent soteriological emphases and describes their synthesis in the *Mānavadharmaśāstra*. Both the eternal benefit ideology and the escalated offering ideology find expression in the Dharmasūtras; I address each of these, then Manu's synthesis of the two.

Efficacy of Meat Offerings in the *śrāddha*

The Gṛhyasūtras do not express concerns over the durations earned by specific offerings, but the Dharmasūtras do. Particularly, that concern involves the duration of the different kinds of meat one chooses to offer in the *śrāddha*. For the first time in the Brahmanical literature, the *sūtrakāras* address how long the oblations will serve the Pitṛs. Previously there was the implicit understanding that the offerings were to be repeated every month,

[288] They praise heaven and the food sent there on the Pitṛs behalf as eternal despite the continual prescription to perform the ritual monthly. This, as I see it, could derive from three mind-sets. First, the heaven and food will be eternal because of the continues performance, i.e., if sons keep performing the *piṇḍapitṛyajña* eternally, thus will the Pitṛs remain in heaven, fed, eternally. Second, there exists a cognitive dissonance between the eternality of the offering and the continued performance of the ritual that fails to rise to the level of creating a paradox, i.e., the ritualist simply don't care that it is not perfectly logical. And, third, the mention of an eternal heaven is just hyperbole. These speculations, it seems to me, are in order by likelihood.

[289] This trend continues throughout the later tradition. In subsequent literature the two threads are merged, so that *śrāddha* becomes not only the key to immortality in heaven, but also the means of achieving any end, even *mokṣa*. Eventually, the power of this rite is even appropriated by Vaiṣṇavaites, who argue, through myth, that the power of the *śrāddha* is in fact the power of Viṣṇu.

thus the duration was not at issue. Āpastamba and Gautama list different meats to be included in the *śrāddha* offerings which grant increasingly longer benefits for the Pitṛs.[290]

> tatra dravyāṇi tilamāṣā vrīhiyavā āpo mūlaphalāni | 23
> snehavati tv evānne tīvratarā pitṝṇāṃ prītir drāghīyāṃsaṃ ca kālam | 24
> tathā dharmāhṛtena dravyeṇa tīrthe pratipannena | 25
> saṃvatsaraṃ gavyena prītiḥ | 26
> bhūyāṃsam ato māhiṣeṇa | 27
> etena grāmyāraṇyānāṃ paśūnāṃ māṃsaṃ medhyaṃ vyākhyātam | 28
> khaṅgopastaraṇe khaḍgamāṃsenānantyaṃ kālam | 1
> tathā śatabaler matsyasya māṃsena | 2
> vārdhrāṇasasya ca | *ĀpDhS* 2.16.23–17.3
>
> 23 The materials used in this rite are sesame and beans, rice and barley, water roots and fruits. 24 When the food is made greasy, however, the gratification it gives the ancestors is more ample and lasts longer, 25 as also when one gives righteously (*dharma*) acquired wealth to a worthy person. 26 With cow's meat their gratification lasts for a year, 27 and even longer than that with buffalo meat. 28 This rule makes clear that the meat of a domestic and wild animal is fit to be offered. 1 With the meat of a rhinoceros offered on a rhinoceros skin, their gratification lasts an unlimited time, 2 as also with the flesh of the Śatabali fish 3 and the Vārdhrāṇasa crane. 4 (Olivelle)

> tilamāṣavrīhiyavodakadānair māsaṃ pitaraḥ prīṇanti | matsyahariṇaruruśaśa-kūrmavarāhameṣamāṃsaiḥ saṃvatsarāṇi | gavyapayaḥpāyasair dvādaśa varṣāṇi | vārdhrīṇasena māṃsena kālaśākacchāgalohakhaḍgamāṃsair madhumiśraiś cānantyam | *GDhS* 15.15
>
> By offering sesame, beans, rice, barley, and water, the ancestors are satisfied for a month; by offering fish or the meat of an antelope, Ruru antelope, rabbit, turtle, boar, of sheep, for several years; by offering the meat of a Vārdhrīṇasa crane, sacred basil, of the meat of a goat, a red goat, or a rhinoceros, mixed with honey, for an unlimited time. (Olivelle)

First Āpastamba indicates the normal materials used in the ritual, i.e., those that are not given long reaching effects on the duration of the offering. Gautama makes the import clear: these offerings last one month, hence the householder performs the *śrāddha* every

[290] With respect to the *sūtra* quoted from Gautama, Olivelle tells us that this *sūtra* is missing from five of the thirteen manuscripts he used for his edition. He also indicates it is not commented upon by Maskarin or Haradatta, concluding "Its authenticity is very doubtful" (Olivelle 2000, 555 n15.15).

month; otherwise the Pitṛs are without food.[291] Whether this interpretation belongs to Gautama alone or is shared by the other *dharmasūtrakāras*, it does not appear to be an interpretation found in the earlier ritual tradition.

The other offerings prolong the duration of the benefit of the offering, i.e., prolong the benefit of the ritual for the Pitṛs beyond the monthly *śrāddha*. It is the meat that gratifies the Pitṛs, and it is the type of meat that induces longer results. Both authors give a short list of different meats and the duration of their benefits; see Table 7. Meat of a cow or a buffalo satisfies the Pitṛs for one year. Flesh of a rhinoceros, the Śatabali fish and the

	Cow	Buffalo	Fish	Antelope	Ruru antelope	Rabbit	Turtle	Turtle	Boar	Sheep	Rhinoceros	śatabali fish	Vārdhrāṇasa	Sacred basil	Goat	Red goat
ĀpDhS	1	1									∞	∞	∞			
GDhS			1+	1+	1+	1+	1+	1+	1+	1+	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞

Table 7: Duration of benefit for Pitṛs from different offerings in the Dharmasūtras.

Vārdhrāṇasa crane will serve the Pitṛs without end. Gautama's list, while admittedly later, not only adds different types of meat, but also has two levels of benefit, though he is more vague than Āpastamba on the lesser level. Whereas Āpastamba makes the lesser duration one year, Gautama merely indicates the meats on his list will last several years.

[291] Interestingly, failures in proper behavior with regard to preparation for the *śrāddha* are also expressed in terms of food, for example:

> śrāddhaṃ dattvā ca bhuktvā ca maithunaṃ yo 'dhigacchati |
> bhavanti pitaras tasya tatmāsaṃ retaso bhujas || *VDhS* 11.37
>
> If someone engages in sexual intercourse after offering or eating at an ancestral oblation, his ancestors eat his semen during that month.

The enumeration of meats fit for the *śrāddha* and the duration for which they serve the Pitṛs in the Dharmasūtras pale in comparison to the list that Manu records.

havir yac cirarātrāya yac cānantyāya kalpate |
pitṛbhyo vidhivad dattaṃ tat pravakṣyāmy aśeṣataḥ | 266
tilair vrīhiyavair māṣair adbhir mūlaphalena vā |
dattena māsaṃ tṛpyanti vidhivat pitaro nṛnām || 267
dvau māsau matsyamāṃsena trīn māsān hāriṇena tu |
aurabhreṇātha caturaḥ śākuneneha pañca vai || 268
ṣaṇmāsāṃś chāgamāṃsena pārṣatena ca sapta vai |
aṣṭāv eṇeyamāṃsena rauraveṇa navaiva tu || 269
daśa māsāṃs tu tṛpyanti varāhamahiṣāmiṣaiḥ |
śaśakūrmayos tu māṃsena māsān ekādaśaiva tu || 270
saṃvatsaraṃ tu gavyena payasā pāyasena ca |
vārdhrīṇasasya māṃsena tṛptir dvādaśavārṣikī || 271
kālaśākaṃ mahāśalkāṃ khaḍgalohāmiṣaṃ madhu |
ānantyāyaiva kalpyante munyannāni ca sarvaśaḥ || *MDhŚ* 3.266–272

266 I will explain exhaustively the types of sacrificial food that are efficacious for a long time and those that are efficacious in perpetuity, when they are offered to the ancestors according to the rule.
267 By offering sesame seeds, rice, barley, beans, water, roots, and fruits according to the rule, ancestors of men rejoice for one month; 268 by offering fish, for two months; by offering the meat of the common deer, for three months; by offering sheep meat, for four months; by offering here the meat of birds, for five months; 269 by offering goat meat, for six months; by offering the meat of a spotted deer, for seven months, by offering the meat of an Eṇa antelope, for eight months; by offering the meat of the Ruru deer, for nine months; 270 by offering boar or buffalo meat, they are satisfied for ten months; by offering rabbit or turtle meat, for eleven months; 271 and by offering beef, milk, or milk-rice, for one year. The satisfaction from the meat of a Vārdhrīṇasa horn-bill lasts for twelve years. 272 The Kālaśāka herb, Mahāsalka crustacean, the meat of the rhinoceros and the red goat, and honey, as well as every type of sage's food are efficacious in perpetuity. (Olivelle)

Manu obviously inherited a common list of meats that have some lasting power in feeding the ancestors. Twelve of the twenty-one meats listed occur on older lists. Table 8 compares Manu's and Yājñavalkya's list to the two lists found in the Dharmasūtras.

	Sesame, etc.[292]	Fish[293]	Common deer	Sheep	Birds	Goat	Spotted Deer	Eṇa Antelope	Antelope	Ruru antelope	Buffalo	Boar	Rabbit	Turtle	Cow	Milk or milk-rice	Turtle	Boar	Rhinoceros[294]	śatabali fish	Vārdhrāṇasa crane	Sacred basil	Mahāśalka crustacean	Red goat	Honey	Sage's Food[295]
ĀpDhS											1y				1y				∞	∞	∞					
GDhS		1+y		1+y		∞			1+y	1+y			1+y	1+y			1+y	1+y	∞	∞	∞	∞		∞		
MDhŚ	1m	2m	3m	4m	5m	6m	7m	8m		9m	10m	10m	11m	11m	1y	1y			∞		12y	∞	∞	∞	∞	∞
YS	1m	2m	3m	4m	5m		6m	7m				8m	9m			1y			∞		∞		∞			

Table 8: Duration of benefit for Pitṛs from different offerings in the Dharmasūtras, the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*, and the *Yājnavalkya Smṛti*.[296]

Like Gautama, Manu includes in his list the materials used in the normal monthly *śrāddha*, and those serve for the expected month. Unlike his predecessors, he subdivides the durations of each subsequent meat in his list, creating a gradation of durable offerings. With a few exceptions the general trend from shorter duration to longer duration expressed by Manu matches with Āpastamba and Gautama's binary division between short and eternal, i.e., those items which serve the Pitṛs perpetually in Āpastamba and Baudhāyana generally do so in Manu as well and those that don't are near the top of his hierarchy.

292 The full list is: sesame, rice, barley, beans, water, roots, and fruit.

293 Manu and subsequent authors tend not to favor fish eating (Olivelle 2002a, 19), but *MDhŚ* 5.16 specifies those that are acceptable for the *śrāddha*. For more on changing trends in the acceptance of fish as an edible or inedible food, see Olivelle 2002a, 19f.

294 Jamison concludes that the authors of the *dharma* literature included the rhinoceros among edible animals, see *MDhŚ* 5.17–18, because of its inclusion in list of meats for the *śrāddha* (1998, 256). For more on the rhinoceros in Indian religion see Jamison 1998, 252 fn. 14, where she lists several works on the rhinoceros in Indian art, folklore, and culture. She also reviews the Vedic references to the rhinoceros (255). Suśruta also addresses the value of rhinoceros meat in a medical context (1.46.52). Of the works she lists, Sax's (1997) work is interesting in that he specifically addresses mythic cycle that connects the rhinoceros to the city of Gayā, which is famous for its association with the *śrāddha* in the later tradition.

295 For more on *munyanna*, sage's food, see Olivelle 2005, 267 n3.257; 1991, 34.

296 For similar lists see also *VS* 80.14 and *MBh* 13.88.10.

This scheme has the same purpose as it did in the *Gautama Dharmasūtra*, to detail the requirements for the ritual to secure an eternal heaven. Implied is at least a tacit admission that the older ritual has its limits, i.e., that the ancestral rites as they had been performed did not grant an eternal heaven—as the ascetic opponents of the ritual life style argue. But the *dharma* literature authors reinterpret the ritual to show that it does indeed produce imperishable food for the Pitṛs located in *pitṛloka*, as long as the proper offerings are made. While normal offerings will last a month, these offerings will last longer, even eternally.[297]

The older assumption about eternal benefit from the *śrāddha*—without the interpretive twist seen here—however, endures in other Dharmasūtras. Other authors preserve the older conception of an eternal heaven won through ritual.

Inexhaustible Benefit

Neither Baudhāyana nor Vasiṣṭha describe the duration of different meat offerings; they do include material that suggests that offerings made to the Pitṛs last forever. Baudhāyana gives more details regarding the procedure than the other *dharmasūtrakāras* and even includes three *mantras* to be recited when the sacrificer touches the food to be presented to the Brahmins. The first is to the father and the other two to each subsequent ancestor.

> pṛthivī samantasya te ‘gnir upadraṣṭarcaste mahima dattasyāpramādāya pṛthivī te pātraṃ dyaur apidhānaṃ brahmaṇas tvā mukhe juhomi brāhmaṇānāṃ tvā vidyāvatāṃ prāṇāpānayor juhomi akṣitam asi mā pitṝṇāṃ kṣeṣṭhā amutrāmuṣmiṃl loke iti | … *BDhS* 2.14.12

[297] This scholastic reworking of the materials offered in the *śrāddha* raises several issues that are not directly relevant to my study. Among them is the relationship of *ahiṃsa* to these offerings. Consider *MDhŚ* 5.31 *yajñāya jagdhir māṃsasya* “Sacrifice is the reason for eating meat” (Olivelle)—and the following, in which Manu argues for eating meat, though only in a ritual context, all other meat eating is wrong—and 5.39 *tasmād yajñe vadho ‘vadhaḥ* “Within the sacrifice, therefore, killing is not killing” (Olivelle). In short, eating meat is an accepted part of performing a ritual tradition and was not changed due to the rise of popularity of *ahiṃsa*, it was simply reinterpreted in a way to explain the apparent contradiction. See also Doniger 1991, xlii). Additionally, it raises several issues with respect to the classification of food. For studies on this, see Olivelle 1991, 2002a, 2002b, and Jamison 1998.

> You are as vast as the earth—the fire sees you, and the Ṛg-verses are your glory to forestall any error in giving you. The earth is your bowl, and the sky your lid. I offer you in the mouth of Brahman. I offer you in the out-breath and in-breath of learned Brahmins. You are inexhaustible. May you never be exhausted for my fathers over there in that world. (Olivelle)

As the father is associated with the earth, the fire, and the Ṛg verses, the grandfather is associated with the mid-space, the wind, and the Yajus formulas, and the great-grandfather is associated with the sky, the sun, and the Sāman chants.

Baudhāyana employs nearly the same *mantra* that Hiraṇyakeśin did to declare the food inexhaustible.[298] He specifically refers to the food offered to the Pitṛs as *akṣita*, undecaying. He describes the food with the finite verb of the same root, √*kṣi*, to diminish, waste away, perish. Words derived from this verbal root have a long history of use with regard to the food offered in ancestor worship and enjoy a central place in all the subsequent literature.[299]

[298] *HGS* 2.4.10.1. Cf. also *GGS* 4.3.10 for the association with earth, air, and heaven.

> athānnam abhimṛśati | pṛthivī te pātraṃ dyaur apidhānaṃ brahmaṇas tvā mukhe juhomi brāhmaṇānāṃ tvā prāṇāpānayor juhomi | akṣitam asi mā pitṝṇāṃ kṣeṣṭhā amutrāmuṣmiṃl loke | pṛthivī samā tasyāgnir upadraṣṭā dattasyāpramādāya | … *HGS* 2.4.11.4
>
> Then he touches the food with "The earth is your vessel; heaven is your cover. I sacrifice you into the mouth of the Veda; I sacrifice you into the in and out breath of the Brahmins. You are undecaying. Do not decay for the Pitṛs there in yonder world. The earth is constant; Agni is his witness, so that what is given is not neglected…."

[299] The association of this term *akṣita* with the food on which the Pitṛs subsist occurs in the *Atharva Veda* (18.4.32 describes their food in heaven and 18.4.36 describes a fountain from which the Pitṛs drink). (Similarly, in describing the offerings to the ancestors *AV* 12.2.32 says, *svadhā́ṃ pitṛ́bhyo ajárāṃ kṛṇómi*. Echoing a desire that the food provided to the ancestors will not decay.) The same word appears in the ritual literature as well: *ŚGS* 4.2.1–8 and *HGS* 2.4.11.4, in which the *mantra akṣayya* is replaced with that appropriate for the *ekoddiṣṭa śrāddha*, Cf. p. 146f and *ŚGS* 4.4.1–15, in which the same *mantra* is replaces with that appropriate for the *ābhyudayika śrāddha*. That the default *mantra* uses the word *akṣayya* indicates the that the association is at least as old as the *gṛhya* ancestral rites. In the subsequent literature, the word *akṣayya* commonly describes heaven in a broader context, e.g., *BDhS* 2.11.7; *MDhŚ* 3.79, *MBh* 3.219.5. But there develops a preference for using this and related words to describe the benefits of performing a *śrāddha*. For example: *akṣita: BDhS* 2.14.12; and *akṣayya*: *VDhS* 11.22; 11.36; *MDhŚ* 3.122; 3.202; 3.273, 275; *MBh* 1.1.203; 1.56.29. The phrase *pitṝṇāṃ dattam akṣayam*, though it occurs earlier, *VDhS* 11.36, is very common by the time of the *Mahābhārata*, e.g., *MBh* 3.80.106; 3.82.72; 3.85.8; 13.61.92. This is not to say, however, that this term was associated only with *śrāddha*, far from it, but more often than not in the later tradition the food offered in *śrāddha* to one's ancestors is described with the word *akṣayya* (or *akṣaya*).

Vasiṣṭha records a similar opinion about the duration of the oblations made to the ancestors in this *sūtra*.

> divasasyāṣṭame bhāge mandībhavati bhāskarāḥ |
> sa kālaḥ kutapo jñeyaḥ pitṝṇāṃ dattam akṣayam || *VDhS* 11.36
>
> During the eighth part of the day the sun moves slowly; this period is known as "midday"; and anything given to ancestors at this time becomes inexhaustible. (Olivelle)

The oblation, if given at the proper time of the day, will give inexhaustible benefit to the Pitṛs. Midday is associated with the Pitṛs as early as the *ŚB* 2.4.2.3, and this association endures well beyond this text. This passage shows that Vasiṣṭha, like Baudhāyana, preserves the conception of the *śrāddha* as granting an eternal reward.

Both of these soteriological threads find expression in the *dharma* literature, but there seems to be a divide, they exist in different texts, like the Dharmasūtras' treatment of the *śrāddha* and reincarnation, acknowledged but kept separate. But the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*, as with other issues, weaves them into a single soteriology.

Soteriological Synthesis in the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*

Manu preserves both ideologies, namely that the food offering in a *pitṛyajña* is inexhaustible, *akṣayya*, for the Pitṛs and the notion of a reward of increasing length for different meat offerings. I have addressed the latter above, I now address the former. In a section that addresses the proper time for performing the *śrāddha*, Manu asserts the perpetual nature of certain offerings made at certain times.

> yat kiṃ cin madhunā miśraṃ pradadyāt tu trayodaśīm |
> tad apy akṣayam eva syād varṣāsu ca maghāsu ca || 273
> api naḥ sa kule bhūyād yo no dadyāt trayodaśīm |
> pāyasaṃ madhusarpirbhyāṃ prāk chāye kuñjarasya ca || 274
> yad yad dadāti vidhivat samyak śraddhāsamanvitaḥ |
> tat tat pitṝṇāṃ bhavati paratrānantyam akṣayam || *MDhŚ* 3.273–275
>
> 273 When someone mixes any kind of food with honey and offers it on the thirteenth day of a fortnight during the rainy season and under the Magha

> constellation, that also is clearly inexhaustible. 274 "Would that a man be born in our family who would offer us milk-rice with honey and ghee on the thirteenth day during the elephant's eastern shadow." 275 Whatever a man gives properly, with a generous spirit, and according to the rule, in the other world becomes eternal and inexhaustible for his ancestors. (Olivelle)

Like Vasiṣṭha, Manu ties the success to the proper moment, but he also emphasizes following the proper rules. The terminology he employs underlines the dual heritage of this view. Manu says that the offerings become eternal, *ānantya*, and inexhaustible, *akṣaya*. The two soteriological ideologies have run parallel through the Dharmasūtras, as mentioned above, but Manu tied them together.

Finally, I address the increased readiness to discuss the benefit to the performer of a *śrāddha*. Rather than speaking to the benefits in the *mantras* employed in ritual, the *dharma* literature openly praises the performance of the ritual in terms of its benefits. The ritual texts assume the performance of ritual; while they do mention the benefits, the importance of performing ritual is assumed. The *dharma* authors, as mentioned above, are in a debate with the renunciate tradition; rather than assuming the importance of performing ritual, they advocate it.[300] As a part of this debate, the benefit for the performer of the ritual receives greater attention.

Benefits for the Sacrificer

The aforementioned passages express a concern for the benefits derives by the Pitṛs from the performance of the *śrāddha*, but as with the older forms of ancestor worship the performer of the *śrāddha* too gains some benefit. While the Gṛhyasūtras do not praise the rites as such—they merely describe the rites that a civilized man should perform—the Dharmasūtras begin to reflect on the effects of performing these rites; they overtly praise the performance of the rituals. We find in these texts a greater concern for reflecting on

[300] Olivelle describes the debates between ritualist and renouncer extensively (1993).

the benefit of living one's life in accord with *dharma*, which for a householder involves performing rituals.

In general the *dharmasūtrakāras* do not explicitly express the benefits that arise for the sacrificer from performing a *śrāddha*; two Dharmasūtras, however, address the benefit for the sacrificer. Baudhāyana begins his section on ancestor worship with this *sūtra*.

> pitryam āyuṣyaṃ svargyaṃ yaśasyaṃ puṣṭikarma ca | *BDhS* 2.14.1
>
> An offering to ancestors is a rite that is praiseworthy and secures long life, heaven, and prosperity. (Olivelle)

The terms of his praise for this ritual are very similar to the praise of ritual found in the older texts, but the scholasticism of the Dharmasūtras comes out more clearly in Āpastamba lists the benefits earned by the performance of the *śrāddha* by the day of its performance; each day of the lunar cycle generates a specific reward.

> sarveṣv evāparapakṣasyāhassu kriyamāṇe pitṝn prīṇāti | kartus tu kālābhiniyamāt phalaviśeṣaḥ | 7
> prathame 'hani kriyamāṇe strīprāyam apatye jāyate | 8
> dvitīye 'stenāḥ | 9
> tṛtīye brahmavarcasinaḥ | 10
> caturthe kṣudrapaśumān | 11
> pañcame pumāṃsaḥ | bahvapatyo na cānapatyaḥ pramīyate | 12
> ṣaṣṭhe 'dhvaśīlo 'kṣaśīlaś ca | 13
> saptame karṣe rāddhiḥ | 14
> aṣṭame puṣṭiḥ | 15
> navama ekakhurāḥ | 16
> daśame vyavahāre rāddhiḥ | 17
> ekādaśe kṛṣṇāyasaṃ trapusīsam | 18
> dvādaśe paśumān | 19
> trayodaśe bahuputro bahumitro darśanīyāpatyaḥ | yuvamāriṇas tu bhavanti | 20
> caturdaśa āyudhe rāddhiḥ | 21
> pañcadaśe puṣṭiḥ | *ĀpDhS* 2.16.7–22
>
> 7 No matter what day of the fortnight of the waning moon it is offered, it gives delight to the ancestors. The specific rewards earned by the performer, however, depends on the time that he offers it. 8 If he offers it on the first day, his children will turn out to be mostly girls; 9 on the second day, his children will not turn out

> to be thieves; 10 on the third day, his children will be eminent in vedic knowledge; 11 on the fourth day, he will become rich in small animals; 12 on the fifth day, his children will turn out to be boys, and he will have a lot of offspring and not die childless; 13 on the sixth day, he will be adept at traveling and gambling; 14 on the seventh day, he will be successful with agriculture; 15 on the eighth day, he will become prosperous; 16 on the ninth day, he will acquire one-hoofed animals; 17 on the tenth day, he will be successful in business; 18 on the eleventh day, he will acquire iron, tin, and lead; 19 on the twelfth day, he will become rich in cattle; 20 on the thirteenth day, he will have many sons and friends, and his children will be beautiful but die young; 21 on the fourteenth day, he will be successful in battle; 22 on the fifteenth day, he will become prosperous. (Olivelle)

Each day of the waning moon is associated with a different outcome, though some are clearly not rewards. Despite the fact that this type of list appears only in the *Āpastamba Dharmasūtra*, the tendency to get into the minutia of an issue like the benefits of performing the *śrāddha* becomes a hallmark of its treatment in the subsequent tradition.[301]

All these efforts to classify, organize, and define belong to the discourse that advocates ritual life over the alternative, renunciation. Like the arguments seen in the Dharmasūtras, e.g., *BDhS* 2.11.27f discusses above, the *dharmaśāstrakāras*, such as Manu are actively arguing for the ritualist life (See also Olivelle 1993). The tradition can no longer assume that ritual is central to a religious life, as the older ritual literature does; they are engaged in an ideological war to show that the householder life is the proper life.

The Buddhist conception of the religious life is a perfect counterpoint to the ritualist's advocacy of the centrality of ritual to the householder life.

OLD GOALS AND NEW CONCERNS: *SADDHA* IN THE BUDDHIST LITERATURE

Unlike the Brahmanical ritualists, the Buddhists experts embraced the renunciation model of religious practice. For the householder who patronized Buddhist religious specialists,

[301] See *MBh* 13.87, which addresses the benefits of the day of ritual performance in greater detail.

however, many of the assumptions about the efficacy, for the deceased and for the performer, were shared with anyone performing the ancestral rites, as we saw in the *Jāṇussoṇisutta*. This section addresses these two different perspectives and relates them to the larger argument about the increased importance of ancestral rites.

Jāṇussoṇi's dialogue with the Buddha makes it clear that he, like other householders, performs the *śrāddha* and is concerned about its efficacy.[302] His two primary concerns are the receipt of the offerings by the deceased and his receipt of the benefits derived therefrom. Interestingly, the first concern is allayed rather easily, but even after the Buddha shifts the focus from the actual ritual of the *saddha* to gifting more generally, Jānussoṇi still expresses a concern that the "giver is not without fruit" (*A* v.273).[303] The householder does not engage in ritual merely to remain active or because it is his obligation. There are benefits that he derives from performing them. These benefits are increasingly associated with Buddhist goals, as the scholars who trace the development of the transfer of merit have shown, but the religious experts dared not eliminate the benefits drawn from ritual, despite their efforts to move to the discussion to a more abstract level.

For the ideologues the ritual was simply a facet of the householder culture they accepted, altering it only insofar as to locate it within their own social and cosmological world, i.e., aligning its interpretation with the Buddhist de-emphasis of ritual and other ideological values. More significantly, they shifted the focus of the ritual performance of the ancestral rites. Gifting had become more central to the Buddhist expression of religiosity (Heim 2004), and thus the ancestral rites were construed as a manifestation of gifting. Beyond this redefinition of the immediate mechanism of ancestor worship, there is a tacit acceptance of the older conceptions of the aims of the rituals. The

[302] See discussion of the *Jāṇussoṇisutta*, which begins on p. 177.
[303] The text is quoted on p. 181.

Jāṇussoṇisutta shows us that the tradition did not dismiss the concern over the feeding of the dead ancestors and the narratives of the *Petavatthu* reinforce the connection made between the obligatory performance of ancestor rites and the cultivation of the proper moral attitude. Further, narratives from both texts avoid underestimating the concern over the benefit sought by the patron who performs the ritual. In short, the Buddhists ideologues could not abandon the underlying concerns of ancestor worship; sustaining one's ancestors and benefiting in turn from the performance of those rituals. The householder's concern over the benefits they drew from the performance of ritual, ancestor rites in particular, drove the religious experts' redefinition of the ritual obligations. The benefits drawn from those performances were surely the same as those expressed in the Brahmanical texts, though the Buddhist authors tended to downplay these "lesser" rewards.

Additionally, without altering the practice much, the experts imbued the ritual with newer values and constructed new notions of what determined the ritual's proper performance. In the *Jāṇussoṇisutta* the discussion of the efficacy of the ritual is turned to the destiny of those who act morally. Similarly, the *Petavatthu* advocates living a moral life, but, more significantly, the authors advocate giving specifically through the medium of the Saṅgha. The ritual is effective, but only if offered through the religious experts of their own tradition, and this is the topic of Chapter 4.

This chapter has described the development of an increased importance given to the ancestral rites. The Brahmanical religious experts associated ancestor worship with all the benefits of the *śrauta* rites, thereby increasing its value to the householder, i.e., he is able to gain the benefits of *śrauta* ritual through the performance of the *śrāddha*. These developments are central to effort by religious experts to reposition themselves with respect to the householder, i.e., to take on the position of mediator. Having laid the

foundation of this development, the last chapter addresses the effort by the religious experts of both traditions to capitalize on their new stronger position and take on the role of mediator between the ritualist and the supernatural entities he seeks to propitiate in ritual.

Chapter 4: Mediation

In this chapter my focus is on a central social function of ancestor rites, namely mediation. The role of mediation is central to understanding the interplay of the householder as religious actor and the religious expert who constructs the conception of that householder's religious duties. The motives of the religious expert in shaping the householder's ritual obligations is most clear in the case of ancestor worship, and this chapter addresses the most dramatic aspect of the construction of the ideal householder. Religious experts of both the Brahmanical and the Buddhist intellectual traditions construct their notions of the householder rituals in such as way as to appropriate for themselves the role of mediator, i.e., as a go-between that effects the exchange between the householder and the supernatural entities that he propitiates in ritual, namely, the gods and the ancestors. In taking this role for themselves they displace the divine fire of the Vedic sacrifice, Agni, as the intermediary and substitute a human intermediary. This chapter describes first the older model of mediation, then the efforts within both traditions to reassign this role to a human actor. Central to the Brahmanical effort is the definition of the characteristics to be possessed by the Brahmin who acts as intermediary. The Buddhists employ a variety of strategies. Finally, the intersection of both traditions' work to appropriate this role are shown to coincide in one particular metaphor, the metaphor of the field and the seed. In the end, this chapter aims to show that the appropriation of the role of mediator illustrates one of the constitutive aspects of the religious experts' construction of the ideal householder.

Certain changes in the role of the religious expert accompanied the waning of the popularity of the *śrauta* rituals and the rising of the popularity of the *gṛhya* rituals. The logistical features of this change have been mentioned already in Chapter 3, but here I

examine the underlying reason for such changes and the social impact of the newer paradigm of ancestor worship. Vedic religion was sacrificial, but in the later period newer models of religious practice arise. Central to those newer practices is broader access to the beneficial powers of supernatural entities, e.g., gods and ancestors. One important factor in broadening the access to the supernatural was the redefinition of the role of the religious expert, specifically the mode of mediation that the religious expert was said to effect between the ritualist and the supernatural entity of his choice. The example of ancestor worship is particularly enlightening with respect to the changes that accompany this new development.

VEDIC MEDIATION

In the *śrauta* model, Agni, the ritual fire, was the sole mediator between the patron and the supernatural beings he wished to influence through sacrifice. The newer model focused on religious experts, specifically ritual gifts made to those same supernatural beings through the mediation of these religious experts. Of particular importance in distinguishing between these two models is the substitution of the Brahmin—who stands in for the deceased in the *śrāddha*—for the ritual fire. The Buddhist ideologues too made efforts to rework the older model of mediation—with the Saṅgha as stand in for the ritual fire—efforts that are most clear in their handling of ancestor worship.[304] These adaptations, however, are predicated on the Vedic conception of ritual.

In the period of this study the efficacy of Vedic ritual faces many challenges, from within the brahmanical tradition and from without. The alternatives to sacrifice that

304 Masefield (Dhammapāla 1996) addresses this trend in his "Translator's Introduction" to the *Paramatthadīpanī nāma Vimānavatthu-aṭṭhakathā*. Egge (2002) addresses it as well from a slightly different angle. While Masefield addresses the role of Buddhist uses of sacrifice in the development of the doctrine of the transfer of merit, Egge traces the role of *dāna* in the development of the Buddhist notion of *karma*.

ascetic Brahmins' offered, which has been discussed often, lies outside the scope of this study; but the efforts of both intellectual traditions' to redefine sacrifice or to appropriate its language to describe and validate newer religious activities are central to this work. To begin, let us consider the older, Vedic model of mediator, namely the ritual fire.

The Vedic sacrifice offers the sacrificer the opportunity to set up stores for his afterlife. This is seen already in one of the funeral hymns of the *Ṛg Veda*:

> sáṃ gachasva pitṛ́bhiḥ sāṃ yaméneṣ́ṭāpūrténa paramé vyòman |
> hitvā́ yávadyáṃ púnar ástam éhi sáṃ gachasva tanú vá suvárcāḥ || *ṚV* 10.14.8
>
> Join with the Fathers, with Yama by means of your sacrifices and gifts in the highest heaven. Having abandoned imperfection, reach your home again; may you illustrious ones join with a (new) body.

The deceased goes to heaven, joining the ancestors and Yama, on account of the sacrifices he performs and the gifts he makes. Those deeds generate the body described in the second half of the verse. The author of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* makes this point more explicitly.

> athá yád váṣaṭkṛte juhóti | eṣá vái vaṣaṭkāró yá eṣá tápati sá eṣá mṛtyús tád enám úpariṣṭān mṛtyóḥ sáṃskaroti tád enám áto janayati sá etám mṛtyúm atimucyate yajñó vā́ asyātmā́ bhavati tád yajñá éva bhū́tvaitán mṛtyúm atimucyata eténo hāsyá sárve yajñakratáva etám mṛtyúm atimuktāḥ || 5 || átha yā́metā́m ā́hutiñ juhóti eṣā́ ha vā́ asyā́hutir amúṣmiṃ loká ātmā́ bhavati sá yádaiváṃ vìd asmā́l lokā́t práityáthainam eṣā́hutir etásya pṛṣṭhé satyā́hvayaty éhy aháṃ vái té ihā́tmāsmī́ti tád yád āhváyati tásmād ā́hutir nā́ma || 6 || *ŚB* 11.2.2.5–6
>
> 5 And when (the priest) offers, after the Vaṣaṭ has been uttered—that Vaṣaṭ-call being yonder shining (sun), who is the same as Death—(that priest) thereby consecrates him (the Sacrificer) and causes him to be born away from death,[305] and he is delivered from that death. And the sacrifice, indeed, becomes his body; thus, having become the sacrifice, he is delivered from that death, and all his chief offerings are thereby delivered from that death. 6 And, verily, whatever offering he there performs, that offering becomes his body in yonder world; and when he who knows this departs this world then that offering, being behind him, calls out

[305] The idea here is that with the *vaṣaṭ* the sacrifice will reassembled beyond the sun. In other words, he will gain immortality.

to him, "Come hither, here I am, thy body;" and inasmuch as it calls out (invokes, *āhvayati*), it is called *"āhuti"* (offering or invocation). (Eggeling)

But[306] the ancient Brahmin could not secure heaven by himself; nor could he perform the Vedic sacrifices by himself. In the Vedic world two entities mediated on behalf of the sacrificer: Agni and the priest, the divine and human mediators respectively; this section focuses on the former.[307]

Agni as Mediator

In the oldest Vedic ritual, Agni mediated between the human priest and the divine. Agni's role as the mediator between the sacrificer and the gods is well known,[308] and Agni's role as mediator is central to the householder's repayment of his debt to Yama.[309] For the

306 This notion appears in the Upaniṣads as well. *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* 1.2.6

> ehy ehīti tām āhutayaḥ suvarcasaḥ sūryasya raśmibhir yajamānaṃ vahanti |
> priyāṃ vācam abhivadantyo 'rcayantya eṣa vaḥ puṇyaḥ sukṛto brahmalokaḥ || 6 ||
>
> Saying "Come! Come!," the radiant oblations carry the sacrificer on the rays of the sun,
> Saying pleasing words and praising him, "This is your auspicious and well-made *brahmaloka*."

Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa 1.17–18 offers a slightly different take on the same idea. From Bodewitz 1973:

> Man has a human and a divine *yoni* and *ātman*. By sacrificing in the *āhavanīya* one produces a second *ātman* in heaven, in the sun, with which one is united after death, if one has the required knowledge of the self. (Bodewitz).

The human birth is man's rebirth in his son (Bodewitz 1973, 52) This passage comes at a point in the intellectual development of soteriological ideas when the entrance to the next word is dependent upon the proper knowledge, rather than simply proper ritual action.

Relatedly, Bodewitz, in discussing the relation of the *bhojanam* in the *śrāddha* and in the Agnihotra, also makes an argument about the transfer of the sacrifice to the Brahmins.

> The general idea of a sacrifice (to and) in the breaths as the substitute of the fires seems to have been transferred by the Taittirīyas to the *śrāddha* ritual, in which the invited Brahmins act as substitutes for the fires (1973, 260).

307 The tradition recognizes Agni as the mediator; we, however, must recognize the priests as mediators on a different level; they were the human agents of mediation; they controlled the ritual, i.e., a patron can only access the divine via their mediation. The priests extensive ritual knowledge and ritual purify qualified him for approaching the sacred fire, Agni, i.e., to perform the ritual on the householder's behalf. The sacrificer derives all the benefit of the ritual performance, thus the priests' role as mediator is clear. The tradition, however, only recognizes Agni as the mediator, thus the religious experts' efforts to transform the ritual interaction between the human and supernatural focus on substituting human agents for the sacred fire, Brahmins or the Saṅgha for Agni in Brahmanical and Buddhist ideology respectively. Since I am most concerned about this transformation, I do not address the priests' role as mediator in this study.

308 See, for example, *ṚV* 1.1.2–4.

309 E.g., *AV* 6.117.1 and *TS* 3.3.8.1–2. See my discussion of the three debts in Chapter 1.

tradition, Agni is the go-between connecting the human sacrificer and his supernatural counterpart, not only transferring the food to the gods and Pitṛs, but even transferring the deceased to the next world (*ṚV* 10.14).

The later tradition preserves this role for Agni. In his Gṛhyasūtra, Āśvalāyana quotes a Brāhmaṇa that indicates that Agni is the mouth of the gods.

> agnimukhā vai devāḥ pāṇimukhāḥ pitara iti ha brāhmaṇam | *ĀśGS* 4.7.22
> It says in a Brāhmaṇa, "The gods have Agni as their mouth, the Pitṛs have the hand as their mouth."

The metaphor of the mouth indicates that the gods are fed through the ritual, as we saw in *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 2.4.2. The fulcrum of this metaphor is Agni. The Pitṛs are said to have the Brahmin as their mouth because the offerings made to the Pitṛs are offered into the hands of the Brahmins, as food. Thus, as the food for the gods is given to them through the sacrificial fire, the food for the Pitṛs is offered into the hands of the Brahmins. The author's—and his audience's—understanding of the metaphor rests on their conception of Agni as the mediator in ritual. This passage also highlights the transition that this chapter seeks to uncover, a transition that saw the substitution of the Brahmin for Agni.

BRAHMIN AS MEDIATOR

As the appeal of large-scale sacrifice in the Vedic world began to wane, the religious experts—specifically those Brahmins who composed the texts on *śrauta* ritual, those who had a vested interest in the continuation of a priest-managed Vedic ritual—found their role in the religious life waning as well. The religious experts created a new role for a human actor to fill; a man who possessed the proper character could stand in the place of Agni as intermediary. The passage from the *Āśvalāyana Gṛhyasūtra* quoted above indicates the parallel between the feeding of the gods through the ritual fire, Agni, in

sacrifice and the offering of food to the Pitṛs accomplished by feeding Brahmins, i.e., "the hand." Just as the Agni mediates between the householder and the gods he seeks to feed through sacrifice, the Brahmin, here represented by his hand, mediates between the householder and his ancestors, by accepting the food given in a *śrāddha*. The parallel appears elsewhere more explicitly.

In the mythic introduction to the ancestral offerings, Āpastamba says:

> tatra pitaro devatā brāhmaṇās tv āhavanīyārthe | *ĀpDhS* 2.16.3
> In this (ritual) the Pitṛs are the divinity, but the Brahmins stand in for the offertorial fire.

The Brahmin stands in for Agni and, as Agni does, conveys the oblations to the gods. This new role of the religious elite, specifically the Brahmin, is most clear in the Gṛhyasūtras.[310] By that time the feeding of Brahmins had become an integral part of the domestic ritual, but the role was not open to any Brahmin; it is available only to the religiously knowledgeable Brahmin. The *gṛhyasūtrakāras* enjoin the feeding of Brahmins in his outline of the basic ritual paradigm, but add a qualification: the quality of the Brahmin to be invited is very important. Additionally, the concern about the quality of the Brahmin invited to the *śrāddha* increases and concomitantly receives considerable more attention in the later tradition.

[310] The exact nature of the relationship between the Brahmins who supported the Vedic model of sacrifice and the Brahmins who supported and composed texts describing domestic ritual is unclear. There was a long tradition of domestic ritual prior to the composition of the Gṛhyasūtras, but there are only traces of this tradition in the extant Brāhmaṇas. It may be we are dealing with two aspects of the same group, or two groups that overlap considerably, or two distinct groups, though I suggest these are in reverse order of likelihood as the few references in the Brāhmaṇas do point to two different ritual traditions that are supported by the same social groups. See my section on the Gṛhyasūtras and Gonda 1977b, 547; Oldenberg 1967, xv–xxii.

Additionally, it must be pointed out that the religious elite in the Brahmanical worldview included all Brahmins, despite a decided emphasis on the learned Brahmin. Thus the efforts of the Brahmanical ideologues and their Buddhist counterparts differ slightly. Whereas the Brahmins advocated the primacy of a community, i.e., Brahmins, the Buddhists were advocating that role for the religious experts alone, the Saṅgha.

This section outlines the characteristics of a Brahmin appropriate to be invited to a ritual—first domestic ritual more generally, then ancestral rites specifically—in order to advance my argument that the role of mediator was one goal in the programmatic construction of the householder's ritual obligations.

The Characteristics of a Brahmin to Be Invited

The concern over the character and learning of the Brahmins to be fed at a ritual is first expressed in the Gṛhyasūtras. In setting out the basic rules for domestic ritual, Gobhila says:

> apavarge 'bhirūpabhojanaṃ yathāśakti | *GGS* 1.1.6
> At the conclusion (of the rites) there is the feeding of the learned (Brahmins), according to his ability.

Like the other *gṛhyasūtrakāras*, Gobhila indicates that the feeding of Brahmins concludes any domestic ritual; unlike other domestic ritual authors, however, he specifies that the Brahmins should be learned. The overall trend in this period, I suggest, is of an increase in this concern, driven by the increased importance of the qualifications of the recipient in the success of any gift. The evidence of the following discussion will bear this out.

Śāṅkhāyana speaks of the qualities of the recipients as well, though in greater detail.

> karmāpavarge brāhmaṇabhojanam | 1
> vāgrūpavayaḥśrutaśīlavṛttāni guṇāḥ | 2
> śrutam tu sarvān atyeti | 3
> na śrutam atīyāt | 4
> adhidaivam athādhyātmam adhiyajñam iti trayam |
> mantreṣu brāhmaṇe caiva śrutam ity abhidhīyate | 5
> kriyāvantam adhīyānam śrutavṛddham tapasvinam |
> bhojayet tam sakṛd yas tu na tam bhūyaḥ kṣud aśnute | 6
> yām titarpayiṣet kāṃcid devatām sarvakarmasu |
> tasya uddiśya manasā dadyād evam vidhāya vai | 7
> naivam vidhe havir nyastam na gacched devatām kvacit |
> nidhir eṣa manuṣyāṇām devānām pātram ucyate | *ŚGS* 1.2.1–8
>
> 1 At the conclusion of rites (there is) the feeding of Brahmins.
> 2 Voice, (pleasing) form, age, learning, moral character, moral conduct: These are

the qualities (sought).
3 Learning exceeds them all.
4 He should not overlook learning.
5 About the gods, about the self, and about sacrifice: These are the three (knowledges) given in the *mantras* and Brāhmaṇa; they are called learning.
6 One who performs the rites properly, one who is studying, one who is experienced in learning, one who practices austerities: Hunger will never again gnaw at that one who feeds one of them.
7 Whichever gods he would satiate at any rite, intending it for that (deity) in his mind, he should give to a person of that sort.
8 An oblation entrusted to one of this sort never fails to go to the god; this one is called the treasure-house of men and the vessel of the gods.

The emphasis on learning—*śrutam*, specifically religious learning—echoes Gobhila's term *abhirūpa*, wise or learned. Further the terms employed here, and elsewhere, specify a conception of learning that is intimately tied to knowledge of the Vedas. The Brahmins—and the Buddhists in kind—value knowledge and moral character, but they also take this opportunity to assert their own identity; the Buddhists make similar distinctions. Both traditions agree that knowledge and good character are required to take on the role of intermediary, but they differ on the type of knowledge and the particular aspects of character that are to be valued.

In addition to these requirements for the Brahmin invited to domestic rites, other *sūtrakāras* emphasize the same characteristics in their instruction about the Brahmins invited specifically to dine at a *śrāddha*.[311] Āśvalāyana enjoins inviting Brahmins "endowed with fame, character, and (good behavior), or with one (of these)."[312] Śāṅkhāyana describes the ideal invitee as learned in the Vedas, *vedavid* (*ŚGS* 4.1.1). This concern over the qualities of the Brahmins invited to a *śrāddha* increases dramatically in the subsequent literature; this is most likely due to the second aspect of the Brahmins'

[311] See *HGS* 2.4.10.2–3 and *ĀpGS* 8.21.2, both of whom mention learning, *mantravat*. Gobhila does not specifically mention the invitation of Brahmins in connection with the *śrāddha*. While Pāraskara mentions inviting an uneven number of Brahmins, he does not comment on their qualities.
[312] brāhmaṇām śrutaśīlavṛttasampannān ekena vā … *ĀśGS* 4.7.2

role in the *śrāddha*, namely their role as stand-in for the Pitṛs. This has been discussed at length in Chapter 2. The *dharma* literature's concern over the qualities of Brahmins to be invited to a *śrāddha*, nearly absent in the previous literature, increases dramatically in the subsequent tradition, i.e., the Epics and Purānas. The new importance granted this aspect of the *śrāddha* is significant for understanding the efforts, and the parameters of those efforts, made by both Brahmins and Buddhists to secure the role of mediator.

Qualities of the Brahmins in the Dharmasūtras

This issue receives an even greater focus in the Dharmasūtras. Each of the *dharmasūtrakāras* lists both specific qualities and rules for making compromises if Brahmins of quality are unavailable.

> caraṇavato 'nūcānān yonigotramantrasaṃbaddhāñ chucīn mantravatas tryavarān ayujaḥ pūrvedyuḥ prātar eva vā nimantrya sadarbhopakḷpteṣv āsaneṣu prāṅmukhān upaveśayaty udaṅmukhān vā || *BDhS* 2.14.6
>
> On the day before or on that very morning, he should invite an uneven number of persons, at least three, who are of good conduct and vedic savants, who are not related by marriage or ancestry, or by a relationship established by sacrifice, and who are upright and learned in the Vedas. He gets them to sit facing the east or the north on seats covered with Darbha Grass. (Olivelle)

Baudhāyana is unambiguous; the invited Brahmins should be *caraṇavat*, well behaved, and *anūcāna*, well versed in the Vedas, as well as *śuci*, virtuous or honest, and *mantravat*, literally possessing a *mantra* or *mantras*. The term *mantravat* used here indicates a continuum between the tradition of the Gṛhyasūtras, where the same term is used (*HGS* 2.4.10.2–3; *ĀpGS* 8.21.2), and the Dharmasūtras. Additionally, the invitees should not be related to him by birth, by *gotra*, a different kinship relationship, or by the associations created in performing a sacrifice. Among the Gṛhyasūtras, this qualification only appears in Āpastamba's work.

In his Dharmasūtra, as expected, Āpastamba qualifies the invitation in a similar manner, but he also makes an exception.

> prayataḥ prasannamanāḥ sṛṣṭo bhojayed brāhmaṇān brahmavido yonigotra-mantrāntevāsyasaṃbandhān | 4
> guṇahānyāṃ tu pareṣāṃ samudetaḥ sodaryo 'pi bhojayitavyaḥ | 5
> etenāntevāsino vyākhyātāḥ | 6
> athāpy udāharanti | 7
> saṃbhojanī nāma piśācabhikṣā naiṣā pitṝn gacchati nota devān |
> ihaiva sā carati kṣīṇapuṇyā śālāntare gaur iva naṣṭavatsā || 8
> ihaiva saṃbhuñjatī dakṣiṇā kulāt kulaṃ vinaśyatīti | 9
> tulyaguṇeṣu vayovṛddhaḥ śreyān dravyakṛśaś cepsan | *ĀpDhS* 2.17.4–10

> 4 Pure and with a composed mind and firm resolve, he should feed Brahmins well versed in the Vedas, Brahmins who are not related to him by blood or lineage, or by a relationship established by sacrifice or pupilage. 5 But if outsiders lack the required qualities, he should feed a man who possesses them, be it his own full brother. 6 This rule clarifies the issue with respect to pupils.
> 7 Now, they also quote:
>> 8 "Feeding-on-another" is the name of almsfood given to ghouls. It reaches neither ancestors nor gods. Bereft of merit, it wanders in this very world, like a cow, her calf dead, wandering among the corrals.
>
> 9 The meaning is: gifts of food that are eaten by one another, going from one house to the other, perish in this very world. 10 Among those possessing equal qualities, an older person if better, as also a poor person who desires to attend. (Olivelle)

Āpastamba lists only one quality to be sought: *brahmavid*, being well versed in the Vedas. Ideally, the householder will find such a Brahmin that is not related to him by birth, by *gotra*, or by the associations created in performing a sacrifice, or being in a student-teacher relationship. An offering to such people, the quoted verses tells us, does not reach the Pitṛs and bears no merit for the sacrificer; in other words it is a complete failure. However, while inviting such a relation to the *śrāddha* is not ideal, it is permissible if one cannot find one learned in the Vedas outside one's relations. Thus *brahmavid* is the most important criterion for Āpastamba; learning trumps all disqualifications. This is one of several ways that the authors praise the quality of learning. Finally, he gives his audience rules for deciding between Brahmins who seem

equally qualified with respect to learning: older Brahmins are more preferable than younger ones and the poor are preferable to the wealthy.

Gautama expands the list from Baudhāyana's two pairs of synonyms—*caraṇavat* and *śuci*, describing proper moral behavior, and *anūcāna* and *mantravat*, indicating learning—and Āpastamba's summary *brahmavid*, which certainly indicates the proprietary nature of the learning that is valued, i.e., they value knowledge of the Vedas specifically.

> śaktitaḥ prakarṣed guṇasaṃskāravidhir annasya | 6
> navāvarān bhojayed ayujaḥ | 7
> yathotsāhaṃ vā | 8
> śrotriyān vāgrūpavayaḥśīlasaṃpannān | 9
> yuvabhyo dānaṃ prathamam | 10
> eke pitṛvat | *GDhS* 15.6–11
>
> 6 One should obtain the best possible food, get it prepared to the best of one's abilities, 7 and feed an uneven number of Brahmins—but at least nine 8 or as many as he can afford—9 Brahmins who are vedic scholars, gifted with eloquence and beauty, mature in years, and virtuous. 10 It is best to feed people who are young; 11 according to some, they should be of the same age as the deceased ancestor. (Olivelle)

Gautama describes Brahmins who are *śrotriya*, conversant in the Vedas, and endowed with *vāc*, eloquence, *rūpa*, beauty, *vayaḥ*, youth, and *śīla*, moral character. He also indicates another opinion that the Brahmins should be the same age as the deceased, but he fails to limit the invitees according to their relationship to the sacrificer.

Neither does Vasiṣṭha mention any limits on inviting any of the relations that Baudhāyana and Āpastamba do. He does, however, expand the category of invitees and mention restrictions on inviting pupils.

> pūrvedyur brāhmaṇān sannipātya yatīn gṛhasthān sādhūn vāpariṇatavayaso 'vikarmasthāñ śrotriyān aśiṣyān anantevāsinas | 17
> śiṣyān api guṇavato bhojayet | 18
> nagnaśuklaklībāndhaśyāvadantakuṣṭhikunakhivarjam | *VDhS* 11.17–19

17 Having issues invitations to the Brahmins the day before[313], he should feed ascetics or virtuous householders who are not too old, do not follow bad occupations, and are vedic scholars, and who neither have been his pupils nor are living with him as pupils; 18 or he may even feed his pupils who possess fine qualities, 19 but avoid people who go naked, suffer from white leprosy, are impotent or blind, have black teeth, suffer from black leprosy, or have bad nails. 20 (Olivelle)

While he agrees on the quality *śrotriya,* conversant in the Vedas, Vasiṣṭha applies it to specific persons: ascetics, *yati*, and virtuous householders, *gṛhasthān sādhūn*. The remainder of the list enumerates negative qualities to be avoided in an invitee.[314] The Brahmins should not be too old, *apariṇatavayasa*, nor engage in improper occupations, *avikarmastha*, nor be a pupil of the sacrificer, though he may feed his pupils if they are of the best character. The other Brahmins to be avoided, save the naked, share a common trait: they possess a quality that disqualifies them from ritual participation. It thus follows that they would be prohibited from participating in a *śrāddha*. The meaning of the term *nagna* in this context has generated many different interpretations, including someone with an unlucky horoscope and one negligent in his duties (Olivelle 2000, 661, n 11.19).[315] This term may refer to the Jain monks who walked about in the nude and are often defined by this practice. Thus this passage would reflect the competition for resources that the Brahmin authors must surely have felt in a culture with an abundance of people claiming to be fit to receive alms.

Beyond these additions, the central characteristic to be sought in a Brahmin is learning. Vasiṣṭha reinforces this with his next *sūtra*.

[313] The practice of giving an invitation the day before also characterizes the Buddhist practice, and may indicate another shared cultural trait of householder religion.

[314] Āpastamba has a list similar in nature, though differing in specifics: śvitraḥ śipiviṣṭaḥ paratalpagāmy āyudhīyaputraḥ śūdrotpanno brāhmaṇyām ity ete śrāddhe bhuñjānāḥ paṅktidūṣaṇā bhavanti | *ĀpDhS* 2.17.21

[315] *VDhS* 16.33, which describes the punishment for perjury as including shaving of the head, may indicate another possibility: that the naked are social outcasts.

athāpy udāharanti|
atha cen mantravid yuktaḥ śārīraiḥ paṅktidūṣaṇaiḥ |
aduṣyaṃ taṃ yamaḥ prāha paṅktipāvana eva saḥ || *VDhS* 11.20

Now they also quote:
If, however, a man who knows the Veda is afflicted with bodily defects that defile those alongside whom he eats, Yama has proclaimed him faultless; he undoubtedly purifies those alongside whom he eats. (Olivelle)

Learning is enough to overcome the detrimental effect of the bodily defects just listed. In fact, the learning of a man who knows the *mantras* will purify those with whom he is seated at the *śrāddha*. Such comparisons reinforce the priority of learning in evaluating the qualities of a Brahmin.

Baudhāyana also lists Brahmins who will purify those whom they join at the meal.[316]

trimadhus triṇāciketas trisuparṇaḥ pañcāgniḥ ṣaḍaṅgavic chīrṣako jyeṣṭhasāmakaḥ snātaka iti paṅktipāvanāḥ | 2
tad.abhāve rahasya vit | 3
ṛco yajūṃṣi sāmānīti śrāddhasya mahimā |
tasmād evaṃ vidaṃ sapiṇḍam apy āśayet || 4
rākṣoghnāni ca sāmāni svadhāvanti yajūṃṣi ca |
madhvṛco 'tha pavitrāṇi śrāvayed āśayañ canaiḥ || *BDhS* 2.14.2–5

2 A man who knows the three "Honey" verses; an expert in the three Nāciketas fire altars; a man who knows the Trisuparṇa; a man who maintains the five sacred fires; a man who knows the six Vedic Supplements; a man who performs the "Head" vow; a man who sings the Jyeṣṭha Sāmans; and a bath-graduate—these purify the people alongside whom they eat. 3 When such individuals are not available, [he may invite] a man who knows the secret texts. 4 Ṛg verses, Yajus formulas, and Sāman chants are the glory of an ancestral offering. He should, therefore, feed a man who knows them, even if he happens to belong to his own ancestry.
5 As he feeds them, he should get them to listen successively to the "Fiend-killing" Sāmans, the "Svadhā-containing" Yajus formulas, and "Honey" Ṛg verses. (Olivelle)

[316] Āpastamba differs only slightly: trimadhus trisuparṇas triṇāciketaś caturmedhaḥ pañcāgnir jyeṣṭhasāmago vedādhyāyy anūcānaputraḥ śrotriya ity ete śrāddhe bhuñjānāḥ paṅktipāvanā bhavanti | *ĀpDhS* 2.17.22

The emphasis on learning is clear and the specifics also accord well with the other *sūtrakāras*'—of both Gṛhyasūtras and Dharmasūtras—use of the term *mantravat*, since the specific knowledge valued here is the knowledge of certain *mantras*. The last *sūtra* informs us of the reason for valuing this knowledge; the Brahmins were to recite these *mantras* at the *śrāddha*. This meshes well with the later tradition, which frequently mentions listening to scripture at the *śrāddha*. It must be reiterated at this point that the terms used to indicate learning, to praise those to be invited to the *śrāddha*, are terms that emphasize Vedic learning. In addition to quality, the authors of the domestic manuals address the issue of quantity.

In his Gṛhyasūtra, Āśvalāyana expresses the sentiment that the greater the number of Brahmins served, the greater the merit accrued thereby.[317] Two Dharmasūtras advocate this view.

> navāvarān bhojayed ayujaḥ |
> yathotsāhaṃ vā | *GDhS* 15.7–8
>
> 7 He should feed an uneven number (of Brahmins), at least nine.
> 8 Or according to his ability.
>
> … tryavarān ayujaḥ pūrvedyuḥ prātar eva vā nimantrya … | *BDhS* 2.14.6
> Having, on the day before, invited an uneven number (of Brahmins), at least three…

Gautama and Baudhāyana advocate higher numbers; both suggest minimum numbers, implying that more is better, but Gautama provides a loophole. His caveat has the same ambiguity as the English phrase "as many as one can afford," as Olivelle (2000) indeed translates it. The ambiguity implies that the poor can invite fewer, but also that the rich should invite more. The Brahmins' investment in this practice and the benefit to his own social group is evident here; it also highlights the Brahmins' effort to secure patronage in

[317] vṛddhau phalabhūyastvam | *ĀśGS* 4.7.3

the new social reality where the Vedic ritual is in decline. His voice is not that of all Brahmins, however; Vasiṣṭha disagrees.

Vasiṣṭha advocates a more moderate view on the number of Brahmins invited, but this should not be mistaken for restraint or a moderation of the claim about securing patronage that I have just made. Rather than advocating a view of moderation, I suggest, this admonition against inviting too many, has the same aim as Baudhāyana: to praise quality over quantity.

> dvau daive pitṛkṛtye trīn ekaikam ubhayatra vā|
> bhojayet susamṛddho api na prasajjeta vistare || 27
> satkriyāṃ deśakālau ca śaucaṃ brāhmaṇasaṃpadam |
> pañcaitān vistaro hanti tasmāt taṃ parivarjayet || 28
> api vā bhojayet ekaṃ brāhmaṇaṃ vedapāragam |
> śrutaśīlaupasaṃpannaṃ sarvālakṣaṇavarjitam || *VDhS* 11.27–29
>
> 27 He should feed two at an offering to the gods and three at an offering to ancestors, or one at either offering. Even a rich man should not indulge in feeding a large number.
> 28 A large number is detrimental to five things: offering proper hospitality, doing things at the right place and the right time, carrying out purifications, and finding Brahmins of quality. Therefore, he should refrain from feeding a large number. 29 Or else he may feed a single Brahmin who has mastered the Veda, is endowed with learning and virtue, and is free of any unfavorable bodily marks. (Olivelle)

Certainly, there is a degree of practicality behind this admonition of excess, but the primary intention is to praise the value of the quality of invitees over the quantity of invitees. While the practical concerns do exist, the primary purpose of inviting many Brahmins would be to receive greater merit, as Āśvalāyana tells us. Vasiṣṭha informs us that the value of feeding a single Brahmin with the proper qualities has an equal merit. The emphasis on the qualities of the recipient appears in the section on gifts as well, with a similar escalation commensurate with the level of learning.

> samadviguṇasāhasrānantāni phalāny abrāhmaṇabrāhmaṇaśrotriyaveda-
> pāragebhyaḥ | *GDhS* 5.35
>
> A gift bears an equal reward when it is given to a non-Brahmin, twice as much when given to a Brahmin, a thousand times as much when it is given to a vedic

> scholar, and an infinite reward when it is given to one who has mastered the entire Veda. (Olivelle).

The escalation follows the increase in the value placed on the type of knowledge possessed by the invitee, not the number; in this way the author further nuances the discussion over the qualities of Brahmins to be invited.

One final note on invitees involves the aim of performing the ritual. Gautama is explicit that this ritual should not be used to create new friendships.

> na ca tena mitrakarma kuryāt | *GDhS* 15.7–12
> One should not use this rite to strike up a friendship. (Olivelle)

The social function of the ritual does not include networking. Other rules quoted above express a preference for not inviting family members or those with whom the sacrificer has a professional relationship, either by having officiated at a sacrifice or being a pupil or teacher to the Brahmins invited.[318] These two restrictions together make clearer the parameters of the relationship between the invited Brahmins and the householder. Inviting Brahmins should not become an opportunity to share the wealth within one's own social group, nor is it the chance to entice others into that group with the offering of food and gifts. Axel Michaels and Philip Pierce suggest that the proscription against inviting Brahmins with whom some relationship derives from the necessary non-reciprocal nature of the gift, *dāna*; that is, there can be no return and the *śrāddha* food given to a family member or other relations "pass mutually (*saṃbhojanī*) from house to house (1997, 251).[319] The concern over the quality of Brahmins invited to a *śrāddha* intensifies again in the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*, further illustrating the increase of that concern over time.

[318] Olivelle says that these relationships establish a spiritual connection (2000, 518 n17.4).
[319] For more on the relationship of the invitees and the householder see Knipe 1977.

Qualities of the Brahmins in the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*

With respect to the number of invitees, Manu agrees with *Vasiṣṭha Dharmasūtra* 11.27–28 (quoted above), which suggests the problems one encounters with too many invitees.[320] The context, immediately before the section addressing the qualities of the Brahmin invitees, however, suggests that Manu's intention is the same: to praise the quality of Brahmins over the quantity. Consider this *śloka*, found briefly after the admonition against inviting too many Brahmins.

> ekaikam api vidvāṃsaṃ daive pitrye ca bhojayet |
> puṣkalaṃ phalam āpnoti nāmantrajñān bahūn api || *MDhŚ* 3.129
>
> Should he feed just one learned (Brahmin) at a divine or ancestral (rite) instead of many who do not know the Vedas, he obtains abundant fruit.

Manu's intent, like Vasiṣṭha's, does not preclude the practical proscription against excess, but it does serve to heighten the importance of the qualities of the Brahmins. But while the quantity of Brahmins is considered less important that the quality, Manu does not restrain himself in addressing those qualities at length.

Whereas no *dharmasūtrakāra* uses more than five *sūtras* to enumerate the positive qualities sought, Manu employs twenty-one verses. The concerns are no different, but Manu simply goes into greater detail on much of the same concerns; his primary concern too is the learning of the Brahmins invited to the *śrāddha*. The lists of Brahmins unfit for invitation are also considerably longer than his predecessors'. While Gautama's list, containing forty-three types of people (*GDhS* 15.16–19), dwarfs the lists in other

[320] With the exception of the last *pada* of the second verse, these two verses are identical in both the *MDhŚ* and the *VDhS*.

> dvau daive pitṛkṛtye trīn ekaikam ubhayatra vā|
> bhojayet susamṛddho api na prasajjeta vistare || 125
> satkriyāṃ deśakālau ca śaucaṃ brāhmaṇasaṃpadam |
> pañcaitān vistaro hanti tasmāt neheta vistaram || *MDhŚ* 3.125–126

Dharmasūtras, Manu lists ninety-six (*MDhŚ* 3.150–168), complete with a partial list of the effects of giving food to such people.

> paradāreṣu jāyete dvau sutau kuṇḍagolakau |
> patyau jīvati kuṇḍaḥ syān mṛte bhartari golakaḥ || 174
> tau tu jātau parakṣetre prāṇinau pretya ceha ca |
> dattāni havyakavyāni nāśayanti pradāyinām || 175
> apāṅktyo yāvataḥ paṅktyān bhuñjānān anupaśyati |
> tāvatāṃ na phalaṃ tatra dātā prāpnoti bāliśaḥ || 176
> vīkṣyāndho navateḥ kāṇaḥ ṣaṣṭeḥ śvitrī śatasya tu |
> pāparogī sahasrasya dātur nāśayate phalam || 177
> yāvataḥ saṃspṛśed aṅgair brāhmaṇāñ śūdrayājakaḥ |
> tāvatāṃ na bhaved dātuḥ phalaṃ dānasya paurtikam || 168
> vedavic cāpi vipro 'sya lobhāt kṛtvā pratigraham |
> vināśaṃ vrajati kṣipram āmapātram ivāmbhasi || 179
> somavikrayiṇe viṣṭhā bhiṣaje pūyaśoṇitam |
> naṣṭaṃ devalake dattam apratiṣṭhaṃ tu vārdhuṣau || 180
> yat tu vaṇijake dattaṃ neha nāmutra tad bhavet |
> bhasmanīva hutaṃ havyaṃ tathā paunarbhave dvije || 181
> itareṣu tv apāṅktyeṣu yathoddiṣṭeṣv asādhuṣu |
> medo'sṛṅmāṃsamajjāsthi vadanty annaṃ manīṣiṇaḥ || *MDhŚ* 3.174–182

174 Two types of sons, Kuṇḍa and Golaka, are born from someone else's wife. If her husband is alive, he is a Kuṇḍa—"son of an adulteress"; and if her husband is dead, he is a Golaka—"son of a widow." 175 These two creatures, born in someone else's field, make the divine or ancestral offering given to them futile to the donor both here and in the hereafter.

176 When a man alongside whom it is unfit to eat looks at person alongside whom it is fit to eat as they are taking their meal, the foolish donor fails to reap the reward of feeding as many of them as have been looked at by that man. 177 When a blind man looks at them, he destroys the fruit of feeding ninety of them; a one-eyed man, sixty; a man suffering from leukoderma, one hundred; and a man with an evil disease, one thousand. 178 When a man who officiates at sacrifices of Śūdras touches the Brahmins with any limb of his, the donor fails to reap the fruit of giving non-sacrificial offerings to as many Brahmins as have been touched by that man. 179 When even a Brahmin learned in the Veda greedily accepts anything from such a man, he quickly comes to ruin, like an unbaked clay pot in water.

180 What is given to a seller of Soma turns into excrement; what is given to a physician turns to pus and blood; what is given to a temple priest perishes, what is given to a usurer lacks stability; 181 what is given to a trader has no effect either in this world of the next; and what is given to a twice-born man born to a remarried woman is like an oblation offered in ashes. 182 The wise declare that

> the food given to other evil men enumerated above, alongside whom it is unfit to eat, turn into fat, blood, flesh, marrow, and bone. (Olivelle)

The concern over the quality of the Brahmins was such that Manu felt the need to detail the negative results derived from inviting such people. Giving to the children of wrongful unions, i.e., mixed caste marriages, negate the benefits of performing the ritual, as do traders. Others in the list bring worse results. Certain unfit invitees negate the effect of those qualified Brahmins next to whom they are seated at the *śrāddha* or other ritual.[321] The number of positive invitees that the unfit persons negate depends on their negative quality.

Next Manu turns to those who, rather than negating beneficial effects, cause detriment to the offering to the Pitṛs. Food given to the seller of Soma is not food; by the time it reaches the Pitṛs it is excrement. The physician, the temple priest, and the usurer likewise taint the offering made to them. This section reinforces the importance of the quality of the Brahmins invited, as it is through them that the Pitṛs receive the offerings. These specific lists often differ in the details, but they all share the notion that the recipient determines the efficacy of the offering made to the Pitṛs; i.e., that the mediator successfully effects the transfer for which he is responsible.

Given this sentiment and the value placed on learning, the hyperbole surrounding the detriment of giving food to someone ignorant of the Veda is not surprising.

> yāvato grasate grāsān havyakavyeṣv amantravit |
> tāvato grasate preto dīptaśūlarṣṭyayoguḍān || *MDhŚ* 3.133
>
> A man will have to eat as many red-hot spikes, spears, and iron balls as rice balls that someone ignorant of the Veda eats at his divine or ancestral offerings. (Olivelle)

[321] Throughout Manu makes it clear that the rules about who is invited apply equally to rituals oriented toward the gods and those oriented toward the Pitṛs with the phrase *daive pitrye ca*.

As with the Soma seller and the physician, those ignorant of the Veda do not merely fail to mediate between the performer of the *śrāddha* and his ancestors, he actually taints the transfer, ruining the food that sustains the Pitṛs. The centrality of feeding the Pitṛs in the *śrāddha* is most clear at these moments. This may account for the rule with which Manu concludes his section on fit invitees.

> na brāhmaṇaṃ parīkṣeta daive karmaṇi dharmavit |
> pitrye karmaṇi tu prāpte parīkṣeta prayatnataḥ || *MDhŚ* 3.149
>
> A man who knows the Law must never probe into the qualifications of a Brahmin at a rite to the gods; when he undertakes an ancestral rite, however, he should diligently probe into his qualifications. (Olivelle)

The Pitṛs depend on the oblations given in the *śrāddha* as food, one cannot be too careful then in assuring that they receive it. Additionally, this points to the importance and centrality of the ancestral rites in the householder tradition; the role of mediator between the householder and ancestors requires significant validation of the qualities of the recipient. Understanding the Brahmin's role as a mode of mediation illuminates the reason for this regulation. The Brahmins fed at the divine rite do not actually mediate between the householder and the gods; Agni does. The Brahmins that are fed are present merely to facilitate, to add a degree of auspiciousness, and to proclaim the endeavor a success (e.g., *HGS* 2.7.17.13). The Brahmins who stand in for the Pitṛs, however, are mediating for the ancestors directly. Whereas one cannot question Agni's authority to act as mediator, the householder is enjoined to query the Brahmin about his qualities to ensure that he is qualified to act as mediator. The success of the rite that feeds the Pitṛs depends on it, as the above list of mishaps caused by feeding the wrong persons shows.

In a similar vein, Manu also enumerates those Brahmins who purify the line of people among whom they sit when fed at the *śrāddha*.

> apāṅktyopahatā paṅktiḥ pāvyate yair dvijottamaiḥ |
> tān nibodhata kārtsnyena dvijāgryān paṅktipāvanān || 183

agryāḥ sarveṣu vedeṣu sarvapravacaneṣu ca |
śrotriyānvayajāś caiva vijñeyāḥ paṅktipāvanāḥ || 184
triṇāciketaḥ pañcāgnis trisuparṇaḥ ṣaḍaṅgavit |
brahmadeyātmasantāno jyeṣṭhasāmaga eva ca | 185
vedārthavit pravaktā ca brahmacārī sahasradaḥ |
śatāyuś caiva vijñeyā brāhmaṇāḥ paṅktipāvanāḥ || *MDhŚ* 3.183–186[322]

183 Brahmins who purify a row of eaters defiled by someone alongside whom it is unfit to eat—listen to a complete enumeration of such Brahmins, who purify those along whom they eat. 184 Men of preeminence in all the Vedas and in all the expository texts, as also descendents in a line of vedic scholars, should be regarded as persons who purify those alongside whom they eat. 185 An expert in the three Nāciketas fire altars; a man who maintains the five sacred fires; a man who knows the Triṣuparṇa verse; a man who knows the six Vedic Supplements; a son of a woman married according to the "Brahmā" procedure; a man who sings the Jyeṣṭha Sāmans; 186 a man who knows the meaning of the Veda, as also one who teaches it; a vedic student; a man who has given a 1,000; a 100-year-old man—these should be regarded as Brahmins who purify those along whom they eat. (Olivelle)

The concern over the recipient, and some of the details, match the Dharmasūtra lists of those who purify those whom they sit next to in the line to be fed. As in the Dharmasūtras, the most common attribute that distinguishes one of these men is learning. Specifically, it is Vedic learning that set men apart as purifying.[323]

The emphasis on learning and moral character found in the Brahmanical literature also takes center stage in the Buddhist reflections on the proper recipient of a gift, most markedly in the *Petavatthu*, for they too are competing for the patronage of the householder.[324]

[322] These verses bear remarkable similarity to *BDhS* 2.14.2–3 quoted above.
[323] What is implied by the knowledge of the Nāciketas fire altars (*śloka* 185) seems ironic. I believe this refers to the first chapter of the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*, in which Naciketas meets Yama and learns about the three fires, hereafter named after him, that lead to heaven. The ironic aspect of this reference, however, rests in the import of the story; it underscores the impermanence of this world and advocates a view that is generally held to be commensurate with the *mokṣa*-oriented ideology, not with the heaven-oriented ideology associated with the *śrāddha*.
[324] The competition is not only between the Buddhists and the Brahmins, but amongst Brahmins with different ideas of the religious life as well. Competition between the ritual priest and the renunciate over sponsorship must be recalled to have a full picture. The brahmanical ascetics' attacks on the ritual institution bear many similarities to the Buddhist attacks.

BUDDHIST EFFORTS TO APPROPRIATE THE ROLE OF MEDIATOR

The success of Buddhism certainly follows from its success in finding a role to fill in the social milieu of its time; the central role for religious specialists was the role of mediator. Masefield argues forcefully that the Buddhists made considerable effort to take on this role as well (Dhammpāla 1989, Egge 2002, Amore 1971, Michaels and Pierce 1997, Holt 1981).[325] The discursive material composed with this aim generally employs one or more of three tactics: devalue the Brahmin as an effective recipient; substitute the Saṅgha for the older mediator, i.e., the fire; and set up the Saṅgha as an effective recipient.[326] The first is a general trend to undermine the authority of the Buddhists' rivals, the intellectual elites among Brahmins who claim special knowledge and moral superiority and through those the role of mediator. This effort operates on the same level as the Brahmanical effort to define the appropriate invitee, i.e., the Buddhists engage the Brahmins in a character debate. The second tactic involves substituting the Buddha for Agni, as the Brahmins did with the learned Brahmin in the Gṛhya rites to the ancestors. The third, similarly, involves a strategic use of language and metaphor to transfer the power before associated with the fire to a human agent, specifically the Buddha or the Saṅgha in his place.

[325] For a later take on the role of mediation in Buddhism, see Holt 2007, in which he suggests that monks of contemporary Sri Lanka "do not in any way offer to broker relations between the living and the dead in a priestly guise," instead this role is taken up in the "informal sector" by priestly practitioners in independently operated shrine (330–31).

[326] I do not mean to imply that acquiring the role of mediator was the only motivation for any of the following material. Buddhist material in general has many different possibly implications and seeking one aim of a text is a mistake, additionally, many of these passages have been interpreted by traditional and modern scholars to have different primary aims. My point here is to show that each of these passages has implications in understanding the role of mediation in their discourse.

Undermining the Authority of Brahmins

In the light of this strategic effort to appropriate the role of mediator, we can more fully understand the purpose of the many disparaging comments about contemporary Brahmins in the Pāli Canon. The authors commonly compared contemporary Brahmins to the Ṛṣis of old; the Brahmins never came out of this looking good.

> Evam eva kho tvaṃ ambaṭṭha, ye te ahesuṃ brāhmaṇānaṃ pubbakā isayo mantānaṃ kattāro mantānaṃ pavattāro, yesamidaṃ etarahi brāhmaṇā porāṇaṃ mantapadaṃ gītaṃ pavuttaṃ samūhitaṃ tadanuggāyanti tadanubhāsanti bhāsitamanubhāsanti vācitamanuvācenti, seyyathīdaṃ: aṭṭako vāmako vāmadevo vessāmitto yamataggī aṅgiraso bhāradvājo vāseṭṭho kassapo bhagu, tyāhaṃ mante adhiyāmi sācariyako'ti tāvatā tvaṃ bhavissasi isi vā isittāya vā paṭinno'ti netaṃ ṭhānaṃ vijjati.
> Taṃ kimmaññasi ambaṭṭha kinti te sutaṃ brāhmaṇānaṃ vuddhānaṃ mahallakānaṃ ācariyapācariyānaṃ bhāsamānānaṃ: "ye te ahesuṃ brāhmaṇānaṃ pubbakā isayo mantānaṃ kattāro mantānaṃ pavattāro, yesamidaṃ etarahi brāhmaṇā porāṇaṃ mantapadaṃ gītaṃ pavuttaṃ samūhitaṃ tadanugāyanti tadanubhāsanti bhāsitamanubhāsanti vācitamanuvācenti seyyathīdaṃ: aṭṭhako, vāmako, vāmadevo, vessāmitto, yamataggi, aṅgiraso, bhāradvājo, vāseṭṭho, kassapo, bhagu - evaṃ su te sunhātā suvilittā kappitakesamassū āmuttamaṇikuṇḍalābharaṇā odātavatthavasanā pañcahi kāmaguṇehi samappitā samaṅgibhūtā paricārenti, seyyathāpi tvaṃ etarahi sācariyako?"Ti.
> "no hidaṃ bho gotama."
> "Evaṃ su te sālīnaṃ odanaṃ sucimaṃsūpasecanaṃ vicitakālakaṃ anekasūpaṃ anekabyañjanaṃ paribhuñjanti, seyyathāpi tvaṃ etarahi sācariyako?"Ti.
> "No hidaṃ bho gotama."
> "Evaṃ su te veṭhanakapassāhi nārīhi paricārenti seyyathāpi tvaṃ etarahi sācariyako?"Ti.
> "No hidaṃ bho gotama."
> "Evaṃ su te kuttavālehi vaḷavārathehi dīghāhi patodalaṭṭhihi vāhane vitudentā vipariyāyanti seyyathāpi tvaṃ etarahi sācariyako?"Ti.
> " No hidaṃ bho gotama."
> "Evaṃ su te ukkiṇṇaparikhāsu okkhittapalighāsu nagarūpakārikāsu dīghāsibaddhehi purisehi rakkhāpeti seyyathāpi tvaṃ etarahi sācariyako?"Ti.
> " No hidaṃ bho gotama.""
> Iti kho ambaṭṭha neva tvaṃ isi, na isittāya paṭipanno sācariyako. Yassa kho pana ambaṭṭha mayi kaṅkhā vā vimati vā, so maṃ pañhena, ahaṃ veyyakaraṇena sodhissāmī"ti. *D* i.104f
>
> But just so, Ambaṭṭha, those ancient poets (Rishis) of the Brahmans, the authors of the verses, the utterers of the verses, whose ancient form of words so chanted,

uttered, or composed, the Brahmans of to-day chant over again and rehearse, intoning or reciting exactly as has been intoned and recited—to wit, Aṭṭhaka, Vāmaka, Vāmadeva, Vessāmitta, Tamtaggi, Aṅgirasa, Bhāradvaja, Vāseṭṭha, Kassapa, and Bhagu—though you can say: "I, as a pupil, know by heart their verses," that you should on that account be a Rishi, or have attained to the state of a Rishi—such a condition of things has no existence!

Now what think you, Ambaṭṭha? What have you heard when Brahmans, old and well stricken in years, teachers of yours of their teachers, were talking together—did those ancient Rishis, whose verses you so chant over and repeat, parade about well groomed, perfumed, trimmed as to their hair and beard, adorned with garlands and gems, clad in white garments, in the full possession and enjoyment of the five pleasures of sense, as you, and your teacher too, do now?

Not that, Gotama.

Or did they live, as their food, on boiled rice of the best sorts, from which all the black specks had been sought out and removed, and flavoured with sauces and curries of various kinds, as you, and your teacher too, do now?

Not that, Gotama.

Or were they waited upon by women with fringes and furbelows round their loins, as you, and your teacher too, do now?

Or did they go about driving chariots, drawn by mares with plaited manes and tails, using long wands and goads the while, as you, and your teacher too, do now?

Or did they have themselves guarded in fortified towns, with moats dug out round them and crossbars to let down before the gates, by men with girt with longswords, as you, and your teacher too, do now?

Not that, Gotama.

So then, Ambaṭṭha, neither are you a Rishi, nor your teacher, nor do you live under the conditions under which the Rishis lived. (Rhys Davids)

The Buddha's admonition of Ambaṭṭha emphasizes the standard of living of contemporary Brahmins; he purports to hold the Brahmin up to his own standard, then shows that he is lacking. The comparisons sometimes employed more direct attacks, openly criticizing the Brahmins for lacking the virtues they themselves held most high. In this passage Kaccāna addresses a rowdy group of pupils, whose teacher is the Brahmin Lohicca.

Siluttamā pubbatarā ahesuṃ
Te brāhmaṇā ye purāṇaṃ sarantī
Guttāni dvārāni surakkhitāni
Ahesuṃ tesaṃ abhibhuyya kodhaṃ.
Dhamme ca jhāne ca ratā ahesuṃ

Te brāhmaṇā ye purāṇaṃ saranti |
Ime ca vokkamma japāmaseti
Gottena mattā visamaṃ caranti
Kodhābhibhūtā puthu attadaṇḍā
Virajjhamānā tasathāvaresu
Aguttadvārassa bhavanti moghā
Supinova laddhaṃ purisassa cittaṃ | *S* iv.117

Foremost in virtue were the men of old,
Those Brahmins who remembered ancient rules.
In them well guarded were the doors of sense.
They had achieved the mastery of wrath.
In meditation and the Norm they took delight,
Those Brahmins who remembered ancient rules.
But these backsliders with their "Let us recite,"
Drunk with the pride of birth, walk wrongfully.
O'ercome by wrath, exceeding violent,
They come to loss 'mongst weak and strong alike.
Vain is the penance of the uncontrolled,
Empty as treasure gotten in a dream. (Woodward)

The Buddha harkens back to a better time, when Brahmins were virtuous, then opines about the lack of virtue in contemporary Brahmins. Those Brahmins, the backsliders of today, fail in their attempts to live up to that standard. The phrase *japāmase*, "Let us recite" is clearly a sarcastic reference to the recitation of the Veda.[327] The Buddha disparages the values held most high by the Brahmins and criticizes their preoccupation with the importance given to "Brahmins by birth." The Buddhist author undermines the Brahmanical authority by devaluing their own claims to moral character and religious learning, substituting their own definition of the proper values in the process.

The importance of the qualities of the recipient of a charitable act is of supreme importance. Thus the aim of this systematic discrediting of the contemporary Brahmins is clear: the Buddhist authors tried to establish the Saṅgha as the preferable choice as a recipient of meritorious giving. They do this by employing ritual-oriented language, as

[327] For the use of humor in Buddhist texts, particularly in disparaging Brahmanical ideologies, see Gombrich (1992).

shown in Chapter 2, and using metaphors that put the Saṅgha on par with the older mediator, Agni, or the contemporary ones, Brahmins, which I discuss shortly.

Substitutes for Agni

The Buddhist author "employs vocabulary and concepts borrowed from the Vedic tradition to attribute meaning to the act of giving" to the Saṅgha (Egge 2002, 19). In doing so they equate the giving of alms to the Saṅgha with sacrifice and the rewards of the former are implied to be equal to or better than the latter. Like the Brahmins, the Buddhist authors looked to the ritual fire as an exemplar intermediary. The Buddha is identified with the sacrificial fire in the *Theragāthā*, "I sacrifice to the fire worthy of *dakṣiṇā*; I venerate the Tathāgata" (*juhāmi dakkhiṇeyy'aggiṃ namassāmi tathāgataṃ*) (*Thag* 343cd). This relies on the ideology of gifting; the *dakṣiṇā*, the sacrificial fee/gift, becomes the model for the later emphasis on giving. Additionally, this parallels the Brahmanical substitution of the Brahmin for the fire seen above in the *śrāddha* ritual of the *Āpastamba Dharmasūtra* (*ĀpDhS* 2.16.3).

Beyond this substitution that employs the tropes and metaphors of ritual to facilitate the transition, the later tradition evidences the simple assertion that the Buddha or the Saṅgha are the proper recipients of gifts, particularly of gifts to the deceased. As we saw in the third chapter, in the "Ghost Story of the Biscuit Doll" in the *Petavatthu* (*Pv* 1.4), gifts, specifically the offerings of the *śrāddha* in this context, established in the Saṅgha will benefit the intended recipient.

> ayac ca kho dakkhiṇā dinnā saṅghamhi suppatiṭṭitā |
> dīgharattaṃ hitāyassa ṭhānaso upakappatīti || *Pv* 1.4.10–13
>
> This gift is made, firmly established in the Saṅgha, will benefit them immediately for a long time. (Gehman)

More significant is the second story reviewed, "The Ghosts Outside the Walls" (*Pv* 1.5), in which the Buddha informs a King that offerings made to him, if dedicated to his

ancestors, would reach them. The Buddha explicitly states his role as mediator between the living and the dead, between a householder and a supernatural being.

The nexus of this theological understanding of the efficaciousness of giving gifts rests on the qualities of the recipient, the Buddha being the most qualified of all recipients, as is shown throughout the Pāli Canon (Amore 1971 en passim). That notion often finds expression in the metaphor a field.

The Field of Merit

As in Brahmanical thought, the idea that the benefit yielded from a gift rests on the merit of the recipient finds repeated expression in the Buddhist materials (Masefield 1989, xxvii–xxviii). In the *Petavatthu* we find this sentiment expressed in the mouth of Aṅkura, who is suffering due to his lack of gifts.

> Ujjaṅgale yathā khette bījaṃ bahukampi ropitaṃ,
> Na vipulaṃ phalaṃ hoti napi toseti kassakaṃ.
> Tatheva dānaṃ bahukaṃ dussīlesu patiṭṭhitaṃ,
> Na vipulaṃ phalaṃ hoti napi toseti dāyakaṃ. *Pv* II.9[68–70]
>
> As a seed planted on a sterile field, even many (seeds),
> neither becomes abundant fruit nor please the planter,
> Just like that a plentiful gift, bestowed upon one of bad moral character
> Neither becomes abundant fruit nor pleases the giver.

This metaphor is shared by Brahmin and Buddhist authors alike; Manu expresses it this way.[328]

> yatheriṇe bījam uptvā na vaptā labhate phalam |
> tathānṛce havir dattvā na dātā labhate phalam || 142
> dātṝn pratigrahītṝṃś ca kurute phalabhāginaḥ |
> viduṣe dakṣiṇāṃ dattvā vidhivat pretya ceha ca || *MDhŚ* 3.142–143
>
> 142 As a sower reaps no harvest when he sows his seeds on barren soil, so a giver earns no reward when he gives his oblation to a man ignorant of the Veda. 143 A sacrificial gift given to a learned man according to the rule makes both the givers and the receivers partake of its rewards both here and in the hereafter. (Olivelle)

[328] This metaphor occurs a number of times in the subsequent literature, e.g., *MBh* 13.90.37.

That both a Buddhist and a Brahmin author employ this metaphor is not surprising by itself, but it does strengthen the sense that both authors occupy a single discursive space; they are engaged in the same exercise of ideology construction, sometimes using the same language (See Masefield in Dhammapāla 1989).

Another example of this overlap in argumentative style and substance occurs in the formula that describes the Buddha as the unsurpassed field of merit, clearly derived from the above metaphor. In the *Suttanipāta* the Buddha is called "the unsurpassed field of merit, the sacrificial recipient for all the world," and "what is given to the Blessed One yields great fruit" (*puññakkhettam anuttaraṃ / āyāgo sabbalokassa bhoto dinna mahaphalan*) (*Sn* 486). The analogy of the field and seed is combined with the sacrificial imagery; the threads are woven together—as I argued Manu did with the *mahāyajña* and the '*huta* scheme'—and the result is a formula that emphasizes the effectiveness of the Buddha, and by extension the Saṅgha, as mediator. By combining the metaphor of the seed with the ritual terminology the Buddhist author taps into two themes that resonate strongly in this culture; the effect connects the Buddha—and the Saṅgha—with the efficacious modes of mediation in a powerful way.

The formula occurs in many places throughout the Pāli Canon, in a consistent fashion, for example:

> bhagavato sāvakasaṅgho āhuṇeyyo pāhuṇeyyo dakkhiṇeyo añjalinaraṇīyo anuttaram puññakhettaṃ lokassā'ti *A* 1.208
>
> The Assembly of Disciples of the Lord is worthy of sacrifice, worthy of hospitality, worthy of offerings, worthy of veneration, an unsurpassed merit-field for the world.

I suggest this formula is constructed to appropriate all avenues of mediation, all the possible ways that a religious expert could mediate for the householder. The word *āhuṇeyyo*, worthy of sacrifice, shifts the offering made in sacrifice to offerings made unto the Buddha and his Saṅgha. The term *pahūṇeyyo*, worthy of hospitality, indicates that the

Saṅgha, not only Brahmins, are also worthy of hospitality and, more significantly, are capable of bestowing the merit derives from offerings hospitality. The third term, *dakkhiṇeyyo*, worthy of offerings, performs the same substitution, but for offerings, including *śrāddha*, as I will argue presently. The term *āhuṇeyyo*, worthy to be offered to, derived from the same verbal root, √*hu*, as the Sanskrit term *āhavanīya*, the name of the eastern fire of the Vedic ritual; this explicitly associates this aspect of the field of merit formula with the Buddhist efforts to substitute the Saṅgha for Agni as mediator. Here the deployment of ritual-oriented language is most clear; the centrality of the verbal root *ā-*√*hu* is also seen in such passages as *ŚB* 11.2.2.6, quoted above, and my discussion of the '*huta* scheme'. The Buddhist authors cleverly constructed this formula, to put it crudely, to advertise their equality with, if not superiority to, Brahmins as effective recipients of all sorts of religious offerings: One stop for all your merit-making needs.[329]

The intersection of this formula with the previously discussed theological constructions of the householder merits review; consider Table 9, a modified version of Table 5 from Chapter 1. The table illustrates the overlap between the Brahmanical and Buddhist expressions of the householder's daily obligations and the Buddhist formula of

[329] In this respect the term *samaṇabrāhmaṇa* plays a similar role; for example, see *D* iii.65–66, where a king informs a man to whom he is giving money how to employ it.

> iminā tvaṃ ambho purisa dhanena attanā ca jīvāhi, mātāpitaro ca posehi, puttadārañca posehi, kammante ca payojehi, samaṇabrāhmaṇesu uddhaggikaṃ dakkhiṇaṃ patiṭṭhapehi sovaggikaṃ sukhavipākaṃ saggasaṃvattanikanti *D* iii.65–66
>
> With this wealth, sir, keep yourself alive, support your mother and father, support your son and wife, carry out your business, establish among the *samaṇas* and the *brāhmaṇas* spiritually beneficial *dakkhiṇā*, which are heavenly, have happiness as a benefit, and lead one to rebirth in heaven.

The occurrence of this term in both Brahmanical texts and Buddhist texts as well as in inscriptions indicates that the term entered into the general vocabulary. This broad use establishes a connection between the ideological discourses that are the object of this study and the activities of Aśoka. Most importantly, the import of this term, in both the Buddhist texts and the inscriptions, must have been significant for it raised the Buddhists to be on par with the Brahmins, seriously undermining the Brahmins' claim to cultural hegemony.
(Incidentally, Law reads the above passage to indicate that the *pubbapetabali* is defined as *dakkhiṇā*, which is clearly an erroneous interpretation (Law 1936, 3).)

the field of merit. The equivalence of *pāhuṇeyyo* and the other terms for hospitality is clear; the term derived from the Sanskrit root *pra-ā-√hu*, to offer, to sacrifice.[330] The term *āhuṇeyyo*, as mentioned above, clearly refers to the offerings made in rituals to gods. My equation of the category *añjalinaraṇīyo* with relatives and acquaintances is based on the proper reception of others in a civil society discusses in other texts. Finally, I place the term *dakkiṇeyyo* on par with the ancestor rites in the other categories, though it certainly refers to a larger category of religious giving. As I have shown in the discussion of the *Petavatthu*, the term *dakkiṇā* is used to refer to the gift given in the *śrāddha*, but the term has a wider semantic range, referring to religious giving more generally, quite frequently with the term *samaṇabrāhmaṇa*, a general term to include religious experts.[331] This final category, I suggest, most clearly reflects the newer model of religious exchange—and thereby mediation—that characterizes the formative stages of Hinduism, particularly with respect to distinguishing it from the previous, Vedic period.

	pañcabali	mahāyajña	*M* ii.186	*MDhŚ* 3.72	Field of Merit
relatives	ñātibali		relatives	bhṛtya	añjalinaraṇīyo
			acquaintances		
guest	atithibali	manuṣyayajña	atithi	atithi	pāhuṇeyyo
ancestors	pubbapetabali	pitṛyajña	pubbapeta	pitṛ	dakkhiṇeyyo
samaṇabrāhmaṇa					
king	rājabali		rāja		
gods	devatābali	devayajña	devatā	devatā	āhuṇeyyo
beings		bhūtayajña			
Veda		brahmayajña			
			ayampi kāyo	ātman	

Table 9: Correspondences between Brahmanical and Buddhist Ideologies.

330 The similarity to *prahuta*, one of the four types of *pākayajña*, is probably not coincidence, though the referent in the older texts is the ancestral offerings and in the later texts the *bhūta* offerings. This is merely another indicator of the popularity of ritual-oriented language and the fluidity of the terminology. Cf. my discussion of the '*huta* scheme', p. 47f, and Tables 2, 3, and 4, in particular.
331 See quote in previous footnote, for example.

This comparison also supports two of the primary suppositions in my study: that Brahmin and Buddhist ideologues occupied the same discursive space and that ancestor worship was central to the conception of the householder. There is no clear directionality to support the supposition that any of these notions moved from one tradition to another; elements of these ideological constructions appear in both traditions in contemporaneous texts quite frequently. Some ideas are shared and the remainder cannot be clearly shown to originate in one tradition and migrate to the other. This also supports my supposition in the Introduction, that these two intellectual traditions had a more complex relationship.

Only three categories of recipient are represented in all these theological schemes: gods, guests, and ancestors. These, I suggest, are the core of householder religion, but ancestor worship seems to play a particularly important part for the later tradition. The greater amount of space allocated to the ancestral rites in the *dharma* literature supports this view. The degree of overlap in the approach, language, and concerns of both traditions' texts strongly suggests that the Brahmin and Buddhist authors both constructed the notion of a proper householder from similar preconceptions. Further both actively sought to construct the category in a way that favored their assumption of the role of mediator, i.e., they were doing the same thing, with the same tools, namely, trying to woo the householder as patron.

Conclusion

The object of this study has been the householder, specifically the theological construction of the householder through the definition of his ritual obligations. By moving from the most basic shared assumptions about the conception of the householder through the historical development of theological responses to this shared conception to the highly discursive constructs of the early *dharma* literature in the Brahmanical tradition and Buddhist sources from the Pāli Canon, I have shown that both the Brahmanical and Buddhist religious experts occupy a single discursive space, in which they shape the notion of the householder and his ritual obligations to the ideological world-view of their respective traditions. The same evidence suggested that a more detailed study of the rituals of ancestor worship in particular would be highly illustrative of the mechanisms and motives of this construction. After a necessarily brief review of the historical development of ancestor worship in ancient India, I addressed the motives and goals for performing those rites. In short, the religious experts increasingly associated the ancestral rites with all the benefits of *śrauta* ritual more generally. Of particular significance was the early association of the performance of the ancestral rites with the attainment of heaven. In Chapter 3 I address this trend and described the synthesis of the two views of the rewards of performing the *śrāddha*, i.e., a permanent heaven and a stay in heaven dependent on the oblations offered in the *śrāddha*. The *Mānava Dharmaśāstra* was shown to be the location of at least two such consolidations: the synthesis of the *pañcamahāyajña* and the '*huta* scheme' and the integration of an undecaying, *akṣayya*, heaven and a concern over the duration of the Pitṛs stay in heaven determined by a gradation of meat offerings made in the *śrāddha*. Finally, I addressed the primary social mechanism by which those religious experts sought to write for themselves a central role

in the establishment of newer ritual institutions of ancestor worship: the role of mediator. Both religious traditions sought to appropriate the role of intermediary for the householder in his ritual, i.e., to mediate between the householder and the supernatural entities that he sought to propitiate in ritual, namely, the gods and the ancestors. They both shifted the role of mediator from the ritual fire, personified in the god Agni, to human agents: the educated Brahmin in the Brahmanical tradition and the Buddha and Saṅgha in Buddhism.

Through this study, I also sought to address a significant heuristic problem. The categories of Hindu and Buddhist have often obscured some aspects of the complex relationship between different religious identities in Indian religious traditions. Despite the admission that Hindu and Buddhist, are terms of significantly later origin, the conception of these religious traditions as distinct entities with clear lines of differentiation has obscured the complexity and interrelatedness of the religious history of India. One of this study's goals has been to undermine this misconception to some degree. By shifting the perspective on the householder and the construction of his ritual obligations found in the theological texts, I have shown that there is considerable overlap in the conception of the householder's ritual obligations and, more significantly, shared methods in the Brahmanical and Buddhist efforts to define the proper householder.

My hope is that by demonstrating that the Brahmin and Buddhist ideologues occupied a single discursive space—i.e., the religious experts shared an ideological understanding of the manner in which they engaged householder religion and shaped it to their individual world views—will help illustrate the fluid nature of the boundaries created by the theological construction of identity that underlie these texts. Further, an understanding of householder religion as a tradition that encompasses both Brahmanical and Buddhist theologies offers an illuminating perspective with respect to understanding

the complexity of ancient Indian religions, particularly the relationship of Brahmanical and Buddhist ideologues and their texts.

Focusing my efforts on the ancestor rites offered me two key opportunities. First, this ritual sequence offered the best evidence for illustrating the interpenetrating nature of the Brahmanical and Buddhist theological responses to householder religion. Second, I was able to describe the earliest historical development of ancestor worship in ancient India, a task long overdue. The dramatic shift in emphasis within the tradition from the Vedic rites of ancestor worship to the *śrāddha*, obscured as it is the by lack of evidence in earlier texts, does find some expression within the Gṛhyasūtras. Due to the constraints of space and the aims of this thesis, some work has been left undone. A broader and more nuanced study of the relationship between different Gṛhyasūtras, and between the Gṛhyasūtras and other texts, will certainly benefit our knowledge of this important historical period. The origins of most of the classic expressions of Hindu ritual can be seen in the Gṛhyasūtras, thus such a study would add to our understanding of the historical transition under study here: the waning of Vedic ritual and the rise of classical forms of Hindu ritual, indeed the waning of Vedic modes of religiosity and the rise of what we now call Hinduism.

I drew upon my historical survey to uncover some of the social mechanisms behind this transition. The decline in the Vedic rites and the rise of domestic ritual are directly connected to the theological reworking of the ritual that is evident in that survey. The educated Brahmin comes to replace the Vedic priest as mediator in the rituals that allow the householder to commune with the divine, and in the Buddhist community the Saṅgha takes on that role. Like the construction of the householder, the construction of the role of mediator in both the Brahmanical and the Buddhist texts share many characteristics. Religious experts in both traditions used sacrificial language to define the householder's

ritual obligations. Both traditions show an increased awareness of the demand for authorized religious experts, and the texts evidence an increased concern for the qualifications of the religious expert who stands as intermediary. In the Brahmanical tradition, the *dharma* literature shows this in increasingly stringent lists of the qualities of a Brahmin to be invited to the *śrāddha* and even lists of those barred from the ritual. In the Buddhist tradition, this concern is expressed both in criticisms of the Brahmanical qualifications and in the mapping of the Buddha, and through him the Saṅgha, on to the role of Agni, the ritual fire. Both traditions sought to define these characteristics in ways that reified their own notions of proper knowledge and behavior. In the end it is clear that the experts in both traditions sought to write themselves into the role of mediator and used similar methods.

Finally, I examine some other social implications of the Brahmanical and Buddhist efforts to construct the householder ideal, based on the foregoing study of that process with respect to ancestor worship. Several motives can be perceived from the establishment of newer, sometimes innovative, ritual institutions that took on greater prominence in the subsequent traditions than Vedic ritualism; among these are: 1. the establishment of one's own tradition as the proper outlet for patronage, thereby securing material support; 2. the constitution of social hierarchies that establish the experts of one's own tradition in positions to exert power over others; and 3. the introduction or reinforcement of the values of the religious expert.

The most obvious motive behind writing oneself into the role of mediator is to appropriate the material support of the ritualist. Religious experts in both traditions lived off the support of the householder; the Brahmins received alms and gifts and are respected guests, while the Buddhist monks received alms and gifts. This is equally clear in both traditions. At the most basic level the Brahmin invited to attend a ritual is fed.

Moreover, the Brahmin who stands in for the deceased receives the food that is offered to the deceased and, in the subsequent tradition, often quite more (Knipe 1977, Parry 1994). The Mahābrahmin, the modern class of Brahmins whose right it is to claim gifts given to the dead, often receive copious amounts of food, clothing, beds, and even money (Parry 1994). In the Buddhist tradition, the narratives of the Buddha and the Saṅgha receiving alms on behalf of the deceased illustrate one primary function of the lay-monastic relationship.[332] That experts on both sides, not to mention divisions within Brahmanical circles and between religious traditions, were competing for the patronage of the householder is clear not only from the amount of anxiety that shows in the *dharma* literature's extensive discourses on the qualification of a Brahmin invited to a ritual, but also from the narratives of the *Sutta Nikāya* that show householders switching back and forth or being won over by the Buddha. But this is only one of the factors to consider when appraising the motives of the religious experts.

My discussion of the qualifications of those invited to rituals illustrates well the creation of social hierarchies, which operates on at least two levels. At the first level, the authors make clear that certain social classes, e.g., the physician (*MDhŚ* 3.180), do not deserve the honor of sitting at a *śrāddha* dinner to receive food. Thus the Brahmin is raised above other social classes. The effort to appropriate the role of mediator as a part of the construction of the householder is broadly an effort to empower the entire Brahmins community, but it is also more nuanced than this. At the second level, a distinction is made between Brahmins in general and learned Brahmins, and in the later tradition this distinction outweighs all others. Manu's concern over ignorant Brahmins receiving the same honor as learned ones is probably behind this injunction.

[332] This is by no means the extent of that relationship, as Samuels (1999) argues quite cogently, but it is clear that the householder was a significant source of income for the Buddhist monastic community.

yāvato grasate grāsān havyakavyeṣv amantravit |
tāvato grasate preto dīptaśūlarṣṭyayoguḍān || *MDhŚ* 3.133

A man will have to eat as many red-hot spikes, spears, and iron balls as rice balls that someone ignorant of the Veda eats at his divine or ancestral offerings. (Olivelle)

By the time of the *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*, and probably long before, being Brahmin is not enough, and the consequences for feeding someone unqualified are disastrous. The Buddhist texts may not take things to the extreme that Manu does, but they are equally concerned with the establishment of hierarchies, though they are primarily aimed at establishing the Saṅgha as a superior source of merit to the Brahmins. The many examples of the Buddha disparaging the contemporary Brahmins and the narratives that show Brahmins accepting the Buddha as their preceptor evidence this.

This last example also indicates another motive for the religious experts who author these theological texts: the introduction or reinforcement of one's own values into the conception of the householder. Most narratives of the Buddha's encounter with Brahmanical tradition—the *Jāṇussoṇisutta* of the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* discussed in the context of the Buddhist perspective on *śrāddha* is but one example—illustrate the Buddha's reinterpretation of a Brahmanical practice within a Buddhist ideological framework. Manu couching the older theology of the *pañcamahāyajña* within the concept of the 'five slaughterhouses' is an example of an accommodation with the concept of *ahiṃsā*. The value placed on Vedic learning, to take the qualifications of the Brahmin invited to a ritual as an example, is another. That the learning most valued is of the Veda, is not an accident; that the Buddhists attempt to undermine this qualification, is no accident either. These values are not simply inherited without internal criticism; they are reinterpreted within the author's worldview. The juxtaposition of the soteriology inherent

in the performance of *śrāddha* with that of *mokṣa* is another example, though a thorough synthesis of these positions does not occur until much later.[333]

In short, the process whereby the conception of the proper householder grew and developed is long and complicated. This study describes the development of key concepts in the construction of the householder within both the Brahmanical and Buddhist theological traditions, demonstrating that the religious experts in both traditions occupied the same discursive space in that effort. Further I addressed one particular aspect of that construction, the development of the role of mediator—or better the appropriation of Agni's role by a human mediator—with respect to one of the householder's ritual obligations, ancestor worship. In that case, I have shown that the experts of both traditions constructed their notion of the householder and his obligations in such as way as to secure for themselves the role of mediator.

[333] See fn. 1 and 15.

Abbreviations

A	*Anguttara Nikāya*
AB	*Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*
ĀpDhS	*Āpastamba Dharmasūtra*
ĀpGS	*Āpastamba Gṛhyasūtra*
ĀpŚS	*Āpastamba Śrautasūtra*
ĀśGS	*Āśvalāyana Gṛhyasūtra*
ĀśŚS	*Āśvalāyana Śrautasūtra*
AV	*Atharva Veda*
BDhS	*Baudāyana Dharmasūtra*
BrP	*Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*
BŚS	*Baudāyana Śrautasūtra*
CU	*Chāndogya Upaniṣad*
D	*Dīgha Nikāya*
GDhS	*Gautama Dharmasūtra*
GGS	*Gobhila Gṛhyasūtras*
HGS	*Hiraṇyakeśin Gṛhyasūtra*
HOD	*History of Dharmasāstra*
JB	*Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*
KaU	*Kaṭha Upaniṣad*
KB	*Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa*
KhGS	*Khadira Gṛhyasūtra*
KS	*Kāthaka Saṃhitā*
KŚS	*Kātyāyana Śrautasūtra*
M	*Majjhima Nikāya*
MBh	*Mahābhārata*
MDhŚ	*Mānava Dharmaśāstra*
MkP	*Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*
MS	*Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*
PED	*Pāli-English Dictionary*
PGS	*Pāraskara Gṛhyasūtra*
PU	*Praśna Upaniṣad*
Pv	*Petavatthu*
PvA	*Paramatthadīpanī nāma Petavatthu-aṭṭhakathā*

Ṛ V	*Ṛg Veda*
S	*Saṃyutta Nikāya*
ŚB	*Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*
ŚGS	*Śāṅkhāyana Gṛhyasūtra*
Sn	*Suttanipāta*
ŚŚS	*Śāṅkhāyana Śrautasūtra*
TĀ	*Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*
TB	*Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*
Thag	*Theragāthā*
TS	*Taittirīya Saṃitā*
Vāj S	*Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā*
VDhS	*Vasiṣṭha Dharmasūtra*
YS	*Yājnavalkya Smṛti*

Bibliography

Amore, R. C. 1971. *The Concept and Practice of Doing Merit in Early Theravāda Buddhism*. Dissertation: University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Apte, Vinayak Mahadev. 1940. *Ṛgvedic Mantras in their Ritual Settings in the Gṛhyasūtras (with Special Reference to the Āśvalāyana Gṛhyasūtra)*. London: Probsthain.

1978. *Āśvalāyanagṛhyasūtram*. Puna: Ānandāśrama.

Aung, Shwe Zan and Mrs. Rhys Davids, trans. 1960. *Points of Controversy or Subjects of Discourse being a Translation of the Kathā-vatthu from the Abhidhamma-Piṭaka*. London: Pali Text Society.

Bailey, Greg and Ian Mabbett. 2003. *The Sociology of Early Buddhism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Berger, Peter. 1967. *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion*. Garden City, New Jersey: Doubleday.

Bhattacarya, Chintamani, ed. 1982. *Gobhilagṛhyasūtram with Bhaṭṭanārāyana's Commentary*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.

Bhide, V. V. 1979. *The Cāturmāsya Sacrifices: With Special Reference to the Hiranyakeśi Śrautasūtra*. Pune: University of Pune.

Blackburn, Stuart H. 1985. "Death and Deification: Folk Cults in Hinduism." *History of Religions* 24.3 255–74.

Bloch, Maurice and Jonathan Parry. 1982. *Death and the Regeneration of Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bodewitz, H. W. 1990. *The Jyotiṣṭoma Ritual Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa I, 66–364*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

——. 1996. "The pancagnividya and the Pitryana/Devayana." *Studies in Indology: Professor Mukunda Madhava Sharma Felicitation Volume*. Edited by A.A. Goswami and D. Chutia, 51–57.

——. 1973. *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa I, 1–65 Translation and Commentary with a Study Agnihotra and Prāṇāgnihotra*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

von Böhtlingk, Otto and Rudolf von Roth, eds. 1855–1875. *Sanskrit Wörterbuch*. St. Petersburg: Buchdr. der K. Acadamie der wisseschaften.

Brereton, Joel and Stephanie Jamison, trans. Forthcoming. *The Ṛg Veda*.

Buddhaghosa. 1994. *Saṃyuttanikāye Sāratthappakāsinī*. Vols. 1–3. Igatpuri: Vipassan Research Institute.

van Buitenen, J. A. B., ed. and trans. 1978. *Mahābhārata 4. The Book of Virāṭa 5. The Book of Effort*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

——, ed. and trans. 1975. *Mahābhārata 2. The Book of the Assembly Hall 3. The Book of the Forest*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

——, ed. and trans. 1973. *Mahābhārata 1. The Book of the Beginning*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Burlingame, Eugene Watson, trans. 1999 (1921). *Buddhist Legends, Translated from the Original Pali Text of the Dhammapada Commentary Part I*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.

Caland, W., ed. and trans. 1984 (1922). *The Jaiminigṛhyasūtra Belonging to the Sāmaveda with Extracts from the Commentary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

——. 1930. “On the Relative Chronology of Some Ritualistic Sūtras.” *Acta Orientalia* 9.1 69–76.

——, trans. 1921. *Das Śrautasūtra des Āpastamba*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

——. 1896. *Die Altindischen todten- und Bestattungsgebräche mit Benutzung handschriftlicher Quellen*. Amsterdam: Johannes Müller.

——. 1893. *Altindischer Ahnencult: Das Çrāddha nach den verschiedenen Schulen mit Benutzung handschirftlicher Quellen*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Caland, W and Raghu Vira, eds. 1971. *Vārāha-Śrauta-Sūtra being the Main Ritualistic Sūtra of the Maitrāyaṇī Śākhā*. Delhi: Meharchand Lacchmandas.

Carman, John B. and Frédérique Apfel Marglin. 1985. *Purity and Auspiciousness in Indian Society*. Leiden: Brill.

Chemburkar, Jaya. 1987. “Pitṛyajña: A Study.” In *Sacrifice in India: Concept and Evolution*. Edited by S. S. Dange. Aligarh: Viveka Publications, 99–106.

Crooke, W. 1908. “Ancestor Worship and the Cult of the Dead (Indian).” In *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, 13 Volumes. Edited by James Hastings. New York: Scribner 450–454.

——. 1899. “Primitive Rites of Disposal of the Dead, with Special Reference to India.” *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 29.3/4 271–294.

Dāsa, Purṇaprañа, ed. 2005. *Harivaṃśa Purāṇa*. Translated by Bhumipati Dāsa. Vrindavan: Ras Bihari Lal and Sons.

Dhammapāla. 1995. *The Udāna Commentary (Paramatthadīpanī nāma Udānaṭṭhakathā)*. Vol. II. *Sacred Books of the Buddhists Vol. XLV*. Translated by Peter Masefield. London: Pali Text Society.

——. 1994. *The Udāna Commentary (Paramatthadīpanī nāma Udānaṭṭhakathā)*. Vol. I. *Sacred Books of the Buddhists Vol. XLIII*. Translated by Peter Masefield. London: Pali Text Society.

——. 1989. *Elucidation of the Intrinsic Meaning So Named The Commentary on the Vimāna Stories (Paramatthadīpanī nāma Vimānavatthu-aṭṭhakathā)*. Translated by Peter Masefield assisted by N. A. Jayawickrama. *Sacred Books of the Buddhists Vol. XXXV*. London: Pali Text Society.

——. 1980. *Elucidation of the Intrinsic Meaning So Named The Commentary on the Peta-Stories (Paramatthadīpanī nāma Petavatthu-aṭṭhakathā)*. Translated by U Ba Kyaw, edited and annotated by Peter Masefield. *Sacred Books of the Buddhists Vol. XXXIV*. London: Pali Text Society.

Doniger, Wendy, trans. 1981. *The Rig Veda*. London: Penguin Books.

Doniger, Wendy and Brian Smith, trans. 1991. *The Laws of Manu*. London: Penguin Books.

Doniger O’Flaherty, Wendy Doniger, ed. 1999a. *Karma and Rebirth in Classical Indian Traditions*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

——. 1999b. “Karma and Rebirth in the Vedas and Purāṇas.” In *Karma and Rebirth in Classical Indian Traditions*. Edited by Wendy Doniger O’Flaherty. Berkeley: University of California Press, 3–37.

——. 1999c. “Introduction.” In *Karma and Rebirth in Classical Indian Traditions*. Edited by Wendy Doniger O’Flaherty. Berkeley: University of California Press, ix–xxv.

Donner, O. 1870. *Piṇḍapitṛyajna: Das Manenopfer mit klössen bei den Indern*. Berlin: S. Calvary and Co.

Douglas, Mary. 1966. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. New York: Praeger.

Dumont, Louis. 1960. "World Renunciation in Indian Religions." *Contributions to Indian Sociology* 4 33–62.

Dumont, Paul-Emile. 1965. "The Kaulikī-Sautrāmaṇī in the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa: The Sixth Prapāṭhaka of the Second Kāṇḍa of the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa with Translation." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 109.6 309–341.

Dutt, M. N., trans. 1977. *Mahabharata*. Vols. 1–7. Delhi: Parimal Publications.

Dutt, Nalinaksha, ed. 1984 (1947). *Gilgit Manuscripts*. Three Vols. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.

Egge, James R. 2002. *Religious Giving and the Invention of Karma in Theravāda Buddhism*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon.

Eggeling, Julius, trans. 1882–1900. *The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa According to the Text of the Mādhyandina School*. Part I–VI. *Sacred Books of the East Vol. XII, XXVI, XLI, XLIII, XLIV*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Einoo, Shingo. 1988. *Die câturmâsya oder die altindischen Tertialopfer dargestellt nach den Vorschriften der Brâhmaṇas und der Śrauta Sûtras*. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.

Evison, Gillian. 1989. *Indian Death Rituals: The Enactment of Ambivalence*. Dissertation: Oxford University, Oxford.

Falk, Harry. 1988. "Vedische Opfer im Pali-Kanon." *Bulletin D'etudes Indiennes* 6 225–254.

Filippi, Gian Giuseppe. 1996. *Mrtyu: Concept of Death in Indian Traditions: Transformations of the Body and Funeral Rites*. New Delhi: D. K. Printworld.

Fitzgerald, James L., ed. and trans. 2004. *Mahābhārata 11. The Book of Women 5. The Book of Peace, part one.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Fortes, Meyer. 1976. "An Introductory Commentary." In *Ancestors*. Edited by William H. Newell. Paris: Mouton Publishers 1–16.

van Gelder, J. M., trans. 1963. *Mānava Śrauta Sūtra*. Vols. I–II. *Śata-Piṭaka Series Indo-Asian Literatures* Vol. 27. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.

Gellner, David N. 1992. *Monk, Householder, Tantric Priest: Newar Buddhism and Its Hierarchy of Ritual*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ghosh, Shyam. 2002. *Hindu Concept of Life and Death*. New Delhi: Munishiram Manoharlal.

Goldman, Robert P., ed. 1984–1996. *The Rāmāyaṇa of Valmiki: An Epic of Ancient India*. Vols. I, II, IV, V. Translated by Various Scholars. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gombrich, Richard. 1992. "The Buddha's Book of Genesis." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 35 159–178.

Gonda, Jan. 1987. *Rice and Barley Offerings in the Veda*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

——. 1980. *Vedic Ritual: The Non-solemn Rites*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

——. 1977a. *Medieval Religious Literature in Sanskrit*. *History of Indian Literature*. Vol. II Wiesbaden: Otto Harrasowitz.

——. 1977b. *Ritual Sūtras*. *History of Indian Literature* Vol. 1. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrasowitz.

——. 1966. *Loka: World and Heaven in the Veda*. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij.

Goody, Jack. 1962. *Death, Property and the Ancestors: A Study of the Mortuary Customs of the LoDagaa of West Africa*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

1991. *Gṛhya-Sūtra of Pāraskara with Two Commentaries of Harihar and Gadadhar*. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Publishers.

Hara, Minoru. 1996. "Ānṛṇya." In *Langue, style et structure dans le monde indien: Centenaire de Louis Renou*. Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 235–261.

——. 1979. "Śraddhāviveśa." *Indologica Taurinensia* 7 261–274.

Hardacre, Helen. 2005 [1997]. "Ancestor Worship." In *Encyclopedia of Religion*. Edited by Lindsay Jones. Detroit: MacMillan Press, 320–325

Hare, E. M., trans. 2001 (1934). *The Book of the Gradual Sayings (Anguttara-Nikāya) or More-numbered Suttas*. Vols. III–IV. London: Pali Text Society.

Hastings, James, ed. 1961. *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Haug, Martin, ed. and trans. 2003. *Śrī Aitareya Brāhmaṇam*, Two Volumes. Re-edited by S. Jain. Delhi: New Bharatiya Book Corporation.

——, ed. and trans.1922. *The Aitareya Brahmanam of the Rigveda*. Allahabad: Sudhindra Nath Vasu.

Hazra, R. C. 1940. *Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*. Calcutta: The University of Dacca.

Heesterman, J. C. 1982. "Householder and Wanderer." In *Way of Life: King, Householder, Renouncer Essays in Honour of Louis Dumont*. Edited by T. N. Madan. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 251–272.

Heim, Maria. 2004. *Theories of the Gift in South Asia*. New York: Routledge.

Hillebrandt, Alfred, ed. 1981. *Śaṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra together with the Commentary of Varadattasuta Ānartīya and Govinda*. Vol. I. New Delhi: Maharchand Lachhmandas Publications.

Hiltebeitel, A. 2001. *Rethinking the Mahābhārata: A Readers Guide to the Education of the Dharma King*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

——. 1897. *Ritual-Litteratur, Vedische Opfer und Zauber*. Strassburg: K. J. Trübner.

Von Hinüber, Oskar. 1996. *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Holt, John C. 1981. "Assisting the Dead by Venerating the Living. Merit Transfer in Early Buddhist Tradition." *Numen* 28 1–28;

Horner, I. B., trans. 2000 (1954). *The Collection of the Middle Length Sayings (Majjhima-Nikāya)*. Vol. I. London: Pali Text Society.

——, trans. 1962 (1951). *The Book of the Discipline (Vinaya-Pitaka)*. Vol. IV. London: Luzac & Co.

Horner, I. B. and H. S. Gehman, trans. 1974 (1942). *The Minor Anthologies of the Pali Canon Part IV: Vimānavathu: Stories of the Mansions and Petavatthu: Stories of the Departed*. London: Pali Text Society.

Jamison, Stephanie. 1998. "Rhinoceros Toes, Manu V.17–18, and the Development of the Dharma System." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 118.2 249–256

——. 1996. *Sacrificed Wife Sacrificer's Wife: Women, Ritual, and Hospitality in Ancient India*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jayawickrama, N. A., ed. 1977. *Vimānavatthu and Petavatthu. Pali Text Society Text Series No. 168.* London: Pali Text Society.

Jha, Damodar, ed. 2001. *The Āśvalāyana-Śrauta-Sūtram with the Commentary of Siddhāntin*. Hoshiarpur: Punjab University.

Jolly, Julius, trans. 1965 (1889). *The Minor Law Books Part I: Nārada. Brihaspati*. *Sacred Books of the East* Vol. XXXIII. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Jones, Lindsay, ed. 2005. *Encyclopedia of Religion, Second Edition*. Fifteen Vols. Detroit: Macmillan Reference.

Joshi, K. L., ed and revised. 2000. *Atharva-Veda Saṁhitā (Sanskrit Text, English Translation, Notes and Index of Verses According to the Translation of W. D. Whitney and Bhāṣya of Sāyaṇācārya*. Three Volumes. Delhi: Parimal Publications.

Jurewicz, Joanna. 2000. "Playing with Fire: The *pratītyasamutpada* from the perspective of Vedic Thought." *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 26 77–103.

Kane, P. V. 1930–1962. *History of Dharmasastra*. Vols. 1–5. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

Keith, Arthur Berriedale, trans. 1914. *The Veda of the Black Yajus School entitled Taittiriya Sanhita Vols. I–II. Harvard Oriental Series Vol. 18–19*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Keyes, Charles F. 1983. "Merit-Transference in the Kammic Theory of Popular Theravāda Buddhism." In *Karma: An Anthropological Inquiry*. Edited by Charles F. Keyes and E. Valentine Daniel. Berkeley: University of California Press, 261–286.

Kāśīkar, C. G., ed. 2003. *The Baudhāyana Śrautasūtra*. New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts.

——. 1958. *Śrautakośa: Encyclopedia of Vedic Sacrificial Ritual Comprising the Two Complementary Sections, namely, the Sanskrit Section and the English Section*. Vol. I, Part I–II. Poona: Vaidika Saṃśodhana Maṇḍala.

Knipe, David. 1977. "Sapindikarana: The Hindu Rite of Entry into Heaven." In *Religious Encounters with Death: Insights from the History and Anthropology of Religions*. Edited by Frank E. Reynolds and Earle H. Waugh. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 111–124.

Köhler, Hans-Werbin. 1973. Śrad-dhā—In der Vedischen und Altbuddhistichen Literatur. *Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.*

1979 (1901). *Kṛṣṇayajurvedīyaṃ Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇam.* Vols. I–III. Poona: Ānandāśrama.

Kumar, Pushpendra. 1998. *Kṛṣṇayajurvedīyam Taittirīyabrāhmaṇam: Śrīmat-sāyaṇācāryaviracitabhāṣyasametam*. Vols. I–III. Delhi: Nag Publishers.

Law, Bimala Churn. 2005. *Heaven and Hell in Buddhist Perspective*. Delhi: Winsome Books.

——, trans. 1969. *The Debates Commentary (Kathāvatthuppakaraṇa-Aṭṭhakathā)*. London: Pali Text Society.

——. 1936. *The Buddhist Conception of Spirits*. London: Luzac and Co.

Lease, Gary. 1994. "The History of 'Religious' Consciousness and the Diffusion of Culture: Strategies for Surviving Dissolution." *Historical Reflections/Reflexions Historiques* 20.3 453–479.

Lincoln, Bruce. 1991. "The Two Paths." In *Death, War, and Sacrifice: Studies in Ideology and Practice*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 119–127.

Malamoud, Charles. 1983. "The Theology of Deb in Brahmanism." In *Debts and Debtors*. Edited by Charles Malamoud. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House. 21–40.

Mani, Vettam. 1975 (1964). *Purāṇic Encyclopedia: A Comprehensive Dictionary with Special Reference to the Epic and Purāṇic Literature*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

McAnany, Patricia A. 1995. *Living with the Ancestors: Kinship and Kingship in Ancient Maya Society*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

McDermott, James P. 1999. "Karma and Rebirth in Early Buddhism." In *Karma and Rebirth in Classical Indian Traditions*. Edited by Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty. Berkeley: University of California Press, 165–192.

——. 1977. "Kamma in the *Milindapañha*." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 97.4 460–468.

Metcalf, Peter. 1982. *A Borneo Journey into Death: Eschatology from its Rituals*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Michaels, Axel and Philip Pierce. 1997. "Gift and Return Gift, Greeting and Return Greeting in India: On a Consequential Footnote by Marcel Mauss." *Numen* 44 242–269.

Mines, Diane Paull. 1990. "Hindu Periods of Death 'Impurity.'" In *India through Hindu Categories*, edited by McKim Marriott. New Delhi: Sage, 103–130.

Mishra, Yugal Kishor, ed. 2004. *The Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (According to the Mādhyandina Recension with the Vedārthaprakāśa Bhāṣya of Sāyaṇācārya Supplemented by the Commentary of Harisvāmin)*. Varanasi: Sampurnanand Sanskrit University.

Ñānamoli, Bhikku, trans. 1960. *The Minor Readings (Khuddakapāṭha): The First Book of the Minor Collection (Khuddakanikāya)*. London: Pali Text Society.

Newell, William H., ed. 1976a. *Ancestors*. Paris: Mouton Publishers.

_____. 1976b. "Good and Bad Ancestors." In *Ancestors*. Edited by William H. Newell. The Hague: Mouton Publishers, 17–32.

Norman, K. R. 1992. *The Group of Discourses (Sutta Nipāta)*. Vol. II. London: Pali Text Society.

——. 1983. *Pāli Literature Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of all the Hīnayāna Schools of Buddhism*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Obeyesekere, Gananath. 2002. *Imagining Karma: Ethical Transformation in Amerindian, Buddhist, and Greek Rebirth*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

——. 1980. "The Rebirth Eschatology and Its Transformation: A Contribution to the Sociology of Early Buddhism." In *Karma and Rebirth in Classical Indian Traditions*. Edited by Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty. Berkeley: University of California Press, 137–164.

——. 1968. "Theodicy, Sin and Salvation in a Sociology of Buddhism." In *Dialectic in Practical Religion*. *Cambridge Papers in Social Anthropology* No. 5. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 7–40.

Ohnuma, Reiko. 1998. "The Gift of the Body and the Gift of Dharma." *History of Religions* 37.4 323–359.

Oldenberg, Hermann. 1988. *The Religion of the Veda*. Translated by Shridhar B. Shrotri. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

——, trans. 1967 (1886–1892). *The Gṛhya-Sūtras: Rules of Vedic Domestic Ceremonies*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Olivelle, Patrick, trans. forthcoming. *Viṣṇusmṛti*

——, ed. and trans. 2005. *Manu's Code of Law: A Critical Edition and Translation of the Mānava-Dharmaśāstra*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

——, trans. 2004. *The Law Code of Manu: A New Translation Based on the Critical Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

——. 2002a. "Food for Thought: Dietary Regulations and Social Organization in Ancient India." 2001 Gonda Lecture. Amsterdam: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences.

——. 2002b. "Abhakṣya and abhojya: An Exploration in Dietary Language." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 122 345–354.

——, ed. 2000. *Dharmasūtras: The Law Codes of Āpastamba, Gautama, Baudhāyana, and Vasiṣṭha*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

——, trans. 1996. *Upaniṣads*. New York: Oxford University Press.

——. 1993. *The Āśrama System: The History and Hermeneutics of a Religious Institution*. New York: Oxford University Press.

——. 1991. "From Feast to Fast: Food and the Indian Ascetic." In *Rules and Remedies in Classical Indian Law*. Edited by Julia Leslie. Panels of the VIIth World Sanskrit Conference, Vol. 9. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 17–36.

Pandey, Umesh Chandra, ed. 1971. *Āpastamba-Gṛhya-Sūtra with the 'Anākulā' Commentary of Śrī Hardatta Miśra, the 'Tātparyadarśana' Commentary of Śrī Sudarśanācārya and Notes in Sanskrit by Mahāmahopādhyāya A. Chinnasvamāī*. Varanasi: Chowkhambha Sanskrit Series Office.

Paṇiśīkara, Vāsudeva Lakṣmaṇa Śāstrī, ed. 1992. *Śrīmad-Vājasaneyi-Mādhyandina Śuklayajuyveda-Saṃhitā (Text and Padapāṭha) with the Mantra-Bhāṣya of Śrīmad-Uvaṭācārya & the Vedadīpa of Śrīman Mahīdhara (With Appendices & Mantra-Koṣa)*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan.

2001. *Pāraskara-Gṛhyasūtram with the Sanskrit Commentary 'Vivṛti' of Śrī Veṇīrāma Śarmā Gauḍa & Appendices 'Mūlasānti', Yamalajanaśānti, and Pṛṣṭodivi*. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Publishers.

1981. *Paraskara Grihyasutram with Margadarshini by Pt. Kulamani Mishra Sharma*. Puri, Orissa: Harihar Jha.

Parry, Jonathan. 1994. *Death in Banaras*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Poleman, Horace J. 1934. "The Ritualistic Continuity of Ṛgveda X.14–18." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 54.3 276–281.

Pratap, Surendra, ed. 1990. *Yajurvedasaṃhitā*. Translated by Ralph T. H. Griffith. Delhi: Nag Publishers.

Prasad, R. C. 1997 (1995). *The Śrāddha: Hindu Book of the Dead*. Delhi: Motilal BN

Premasiri, P. D. 1991. "Significance of the Ritual Concerning Offerings to Ancestors in Theravāda Buddhism." In *Buddhist Thought and Ritual*. Edited by David J. Kalupahana. New York: Paragon Press, 151–158.

Rai, Ganga Sagar, ed. and trans. 1995. *Śāṃkhāyana Gṛhyasūtra [with Nārāyaṇa Bhāṣya, Sāṃkhāyana Gṛhyasaṃgraha of Vāsudeva; Hindi Translation of Sūtras, Introduction and Appendices]*. Varanasi: Ratnā Publications.

Ranade, H. G., trans. 1978. *Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra (Rules for the Vedic Sacrifice)*. Pune: Ranade.

Reynolds, Frank E. and Earle H. Waugh, eds. 1977. *Religious Encounters with Death: Insights from the History and Anthropology of Religions*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Rhys Davids, Caroline A. F., trans. 1999. (1917). *The Book of Kindred Sayings (Saṃyutta-Nikāya) or Grouped Suttas*. Vol. I. London: Pali Text Society.

——. 1986 (1913). *Psalms of the Sisters*. *Sacred Writings of the Buddhists Vol. I.* New Delhi: Cosmo Publications.

——, trans. 1986 (1913). *Psalms of the Brethren*. *Sacred Writings of the Buddhists Vol. II.* New Delhi: Cosmo Publications.

——, trans. 1986c (1913). *Psalms of the Brethren*. *Sacred Writings of the Buddhists Vol. III.* New Delhi: Cosmo Publications.

Rhys Davids, Thomas William, and C. A. F. Rhys Davids, trans. 2002 (1921). *Dialogues of the Buddha Translated from the Pāli of the Dīgha-Nikāya*. *Part II. Sacred Books of the Buddhists Vol. IV*. London: Pali Text Society.

Rocher, Ludo. 1986. *The Purāṇas*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrasowitz.

——. 1980. "Karma and Rebirth in the Dharmaśāstras." In *Karma and Rebirth in Classical Indian Traditions*. Edited by Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty. Berkeley: University of California Press, 61–89.

Roy, Pratap Chandra, trans. 1962. *The Mahabharata of Krishna-Dwaipayana Vyasa*. Vols. 1–12. Calcutta: Oriental Publishing Co.

Saindon, Marcelle. 1999. "The Pertinence of the Śrāddha rituals in the Context of Transmigration and Liberation according to the Pitṛkalpa of the Harivaṃśa." *Purāṇam* 41.1 5–17.

Samuels, Jeffrey. 1999. "Views of Householders and Lay Disciples in the *Sutta Piṭaka: A Reconsideration of the Lay/Monastic Opposition*." *Religion* 29 231–241.

Sand, Erik Reenberg. 1986. "The śrāddha (ancestor worship) According to Some Important Purāṇas: Some Facets." In *South Asian Religion and Society*. Edited by Asko Parpola and Bent Smidt Hansen. London: Curzon Press.

1989. *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*. Vol. I–II. Delhi: Bhāratīya Vidya Prakāśan.

1987. *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa According to the Mādhyandina Recension with the Vedaraprakāśa Bhāṣya of Sāyaṇācārya Supplemented by the Commentary of Harisvāmin*. Five Volumes. Delhi: Gian Publishing House.

Sax, William S. 1997. "Fathers, Sons, and Rhinoceroses: Masculinity and Violence in the Pandav Lila." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 117.2 278–293.

Schopen, Gregory. 2004. "Dead Monks and Bad Debts: Some Provisions of a Buddhistic Monastic Inheritance Law." In *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: The University of Hawai'i Press, 122–169.

——. 1997. Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism: The Layman/Monk Distinction and the Doctrines of the Transfer of Merit." In *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks: Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: The University of Hawai'i Press, 23–55.

Sharma, Narendra Nath, trans. 1976. *Āśvalāyana Gṛhyasūtram with Sanskrit Commentary of Nārāyaṇa*. Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers.

Shastri, A. Mahadeva, ed. 1979 (1950). *Paraśurāmakalpasūtra with the Commentaries 'Vṛtti' by Śrī Rāmeśvara 'Nīrakṣīraviveka' by Param Hans Mishra 'Hans'*. Baroda: Oriental Institute.

Shastri, Dakshina Ranjan. 1963. *Origin and Development of the Rituals of Ancestor Worship in India*. Calcutta: Bookland Private Limited.

Shastri, Vishvanath. 1971. *Shraddakalpa of Chaturvarga Chintamani*. Part I. Translated by Sri Hemadri Pandit. Varanasi: Banaras Hindu University.

Singh, Purushottam. 1970. *Burial Practices in Ancient India (A Study in the Eschatological Beliefs of Early Man as Revealed by Archaeological Sources)*. Varanasi: Prithivi Prakashan.

Singh, Thakur Udaya Narain, trans. 1992. *Gobhila Gṛhyasūtram with Sanskrit Commentary*. Delhi: Choukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan.

Sircar, D. C. 1971. *Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Smith, Brian K. 1996. "Ritual Perfection and Ritual Sabotage in the Veda." *History of Religions* 35.4 285–306.

——. 1995. *Classifying the Universe: The Ancient Indian* Varṇa *System and the Origins of Caste*. New York: Oxford University Press.

——. 1989. *Reflections on Resemblance, Ritual, and Religion*. New York: Oxford.

Smith, Robert J. 1974. *Ancestor Worship in Contemporary Japan*. Stanford, California: Standford University Press.

Sprockhoff, J. F. 1980. "Die feindlichen Toten und der befriedete Tote" In *Leben und Tod in den Religionen. Symbol und Wirklichkeit*. Edited by Gunther Stephenson Darmstadt: Wissenschaftl. Buchgesell., 263–284.

Sreekrishna Sarma, E. R., ed. 1968. *Kauṣītaky-Brāhmaṇa*. Three Vols. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH.

von Stietencron, Heinrich. 1976. "Vom Tod im Leben und vom Leben in Tod." In *Der Mensch und sein Tod*. Edited by Johannes Schwartländer. Göttingen:

Strong, D. M. 1902. *The Udāna or The Solemn Utterances of the Buddha*. London: Luzac.

Suktankar, Vishnu Sitaram. 1927–1966. *The Mahabharata*. Vols. I–IXX. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute

Thapar, Romila. 1982. "Householders and Renounces in the Brahmanical and Buddhist Traditions." In *Way of Life: King, Householder, Renouncer Essays in Honour of Louis Dumont*. Edited by T. N. Madan. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 273–298.

Thite, Ganesh Umakant, ed. 2004. *Āpastamba-Śrauta-Sūtra*. Vol. 1–2. Delhi: New Bharatiya Book Corporation.

——. 1975. *Sacrifice in the Brāhmaṇa-texts*. Poona: Poona University Press.

Tull, Herman W. 1989. *The Vedic Origins of Karma: Cosmos as Man in Ancient Indian Myth and Ritual*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Vidyālaṇkār, Kailāśacandra. 1976. *Pitṛ-Pūjā: ārya pūjā-paddhati meṃ udbhava aur vikās*. Delhi: Bhāratīya Granth Nikelan.

Vidyāratna, Rāmanārāyana and Ānandachandra Vedātāvāgīsa, eds. 1869. *The Grihyasūtra of Āśvalāyana, with the Commentary of Gārgya Nārāyana*. Calcutta: C. B. Lewis Baptist Mission Press.

Walters, Jonathan S. 2003. "Deanimating and Reanimating the Dead in Rural Sri Lanka." In *The Living and the Dead: the Social Dimensions of Death in South Asian Religions*. Edited by Liz Wilson. Albany: State University of New York Press, 112–126.

Weber, Albrecht, ed. 1973 [1871]. *Die Taittirîya Saṃ*hitâ. *Indische Studien: Beiträge für die Kunde des indischen Alterhums*. Vol. XI–XII. Hildesheim: Gerog Olms Verlag.

——, ed. 1964. *The Çatapatha-Brāhmaṇa in the Mādhyandina-Çākhā with Extracts from the Commentaries of Sāyaṇa, Harisvāmin and Dvivedaganga*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.

Whitaker, Jarrod L. forthcoming. "Who Gets to Live Forever in Ancient India? Rethinking *ā́yus* ("life") in the *Ṛgveda*." In *Essays on South Asian in Honor of Patrick Olivelle*. Edited by Steven E. Lindquist. Firenze: Firenze University Press.

Wilson, Liz. 2003. *The Living and the Dead: the Social Dimensions of Death in South Asian Religions*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Winternitz, M., ed. 1887. *Āpastambīya Gṛhyasūtra with Extracts from the Commentaries of Haradatta and Sudarśanārya*. Vienna: Alfred Hölder.

Witzel, Michael. 1997. "The Development of the Vedic Canon and its Schools: The Social and Political Milieu." In *Inside the Texts and Beyond the Texts: New Approaches to the Study of the Vedas*. Edited by Michael Witzel, 257–348.

Woodward, F. L., trans. 2000–2001 (1932–1933). *The Book of the Gradual Sayings (Anguttara-Nikāya) or More-numbered Suttas*. Vol I–II. London: Pali Text Society.

——, trans. 1996 (1936). *The Book of the Gradual Sayings (Anguttara-Nikāya) or More-numbered Suttas*. Vol V. London: Pali Text Society.

——, trans. 1996. (1927). *The Book of Kindred Sayings (Saṃyutta-Nikāya) or Grouped Suttas*. Vol. IV. London: Pali Text Society.

——. 1914. “The Buddhist Doctrine of Reversible Merit.” *The Buddhist Review* 6 38–50.

Vita

Matthew Rae Sayers was born on July 26th 1971 to Dennis Rae Sayers and Kathleen Ann Sayers on Misawa Air Force Base in Misawa, Japan. He graduated from Meade Senior High School at Ft. Meade, Maryland and attended Anne Arundel Community College in Arnold, Maryland and Howard Community College in Columbia, Maryland. He earned a B.A. in Interdisciplinary Studies with a focus on Comparative Religion and Moral Philosophy at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County in Baltimore, Maryland. He received his M.A. in Religious Studies from Florida State University in Tallahassee, Florida. While attending the University of Texas at Austin he taught two classes: "Cadavers, Crows, and Cremation: Death and Dying in Indian Religions" and "Introduction to Hinduism." Upon completion of his Ph.D. in Asian Cultures and Languages at the University of Texas at Austin, he will up a position as Visiting Assistant Professor of Religion and Philosophy at Lebanon Valley College in Annville, Pennsylvania.

Permanent address: 10701 Marshitah's Way, Austin TX 78748

This dissertation was typed by Matthew Rae Sayers.